

Historic, Archive Document

Do not assume content reflects current scientific knowledge, policies, or practices.



LEGISLATIVE HISTORY

Public Law 360--80th Congress

Chapter 488--1st Session

S. 1498

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Digest of Public Law 360	1
Index and Summary of History on S. 1498	2

DIGEST OF PUBLIC LAW 360

WOOL PRICE SUPPORTS. Directs the Commodity Credit Corporation to continue until December 31, 1948, to support a price to producers of wool at the price it supported wool in 1946; authorizes the Corporation to adjust support prices for individual grades and qualities of wool and to make discounts for off-quality, inferior grade, or poorly prepared wool; authorizes use of county and local committees and other authorized agencies in carrying out the support program; and provides that the Corporation may, until December 31, 1948, dispose of wool owned by it without regard to any restriction imposed upon it by law.

INDEX AND SUMMARY OF HISTORY ON S. 1498.

Note: See S. 814, vetoed June 26, 1947.

March 4, 1947

Hearings: House, H. R. 63, H. R. 1890 and H. R. 2318.
(On vetoed bill).

March 26, 1947

Hearings: Senate, S. 103, S. 814, and S. 917.
(On vetoed bill).

June 26, 1947

S. 1498 was introduced by Senator Robertson and was referred to the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Senate Committee reported, without amendment, S. 1498. Senate Report 377. Print of the bill as reported.

S. 1498 debated in the Senate and passed as reported.

June 27, 1947

S. 1498 was referred to the House Committee on Agriculture. Print of the bill as referred.

July 12, 1947

The House Agriculture Committee approved, but did not actually report, S. 1498.

July 15, 1947

House Committee reported, without amendment, S. 1498. House Report 920. Print of the bill as reported.

Remarks of Rep. Mansfield.

July 18, 1947

Resume of Hearings.

House Rules Committee reported H. Res. 315 for the consideration of H. R. 1498. House Report 1001. Print of the Resolution.

July 25, 1947

House debated S. 1498.

July 26, 1947

House concluded debate and passed S. 1498 without amendment.

August 5, 1947

Approved. Public Law 360.

DIGEST OF
CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS
OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE

Division of Legislative Reports
(For Department staff only)

Issued June 27, 1947
For actions of June 26, 1947
80th-1st, No. 122

CONTENTS

Accounting.....	35	Forests and forestry.....	10,	Prices, support.....	1
Appropriations..	7,12,14,16,28		12,25,51	Property, surplus.....	33
C.C.C.....	17	Information.....	16	R.F.C.....	11,22
Committees.....	8,36	Insect control.....	50,51	Remount service.....	3
Communications.....	21	Labor, farm.....	20	Research.....	4,12,47
Cooperatives.....	49	Lands.....	6,25,26,34	Rubber.....	31
Corporations.....	9,17,22	Lands, grazing.....	43	School-lunch program.....	12
Crop insurance.....	2	Lands, reclamation.....	30,52	Social security.....	20
Electrification.....	42	Livestock & meat.....	4,13,41,46	Soil conservation.....	12,44
Electrification, rural.....	5	Loans, farm.....	12,22	Territories & possessions.....	25
Farm program.....	8	Machinery, farm.....	40	Trade, foreign.....	18,23
Fats and oils.....	23	Marketing.....	50	Transportation.....	19,48
Flood control.....	15,33,38	Organization, executive.....	24	Veterans' benefits.....	25
Food supply.....	27	Personnel.....	45	War powers.....	18,19,23
Foreign affairs.....	1,15,27,	Prices.....	41	Water, pollution.....	37
	29,39	Grain.....	23	Wool.....	1,32

HIGHLIGHTS: Senate received veto message on wool bill and passed new bill without import-control provision. Senate committees reported bills to place crop insurance on limited basis, transfer Remount Service to USDA, authorize research and eradication of cattle grubs, provide for REA refinancing of TVA loans to cities, consolidate appropriation bills, create joint committee to investigate agriculture. House passed bill to continue certain allocations, priorities, and export-control powers. H. Rules cleared bill to continue export controls. House passed bill to create Commission on Organization of Executive Branch. House committees reported CCC-continuation and legislative-appropriation bills and approved veterans' Alaska settlement bill. Rep. Harrison criticized USDA's foreign food-purchase policies. House received conference report on RFC-extension bill.

SENATE

- 1. WOOL-PRICE SUPPORTS.** Received from the President a veto message on S. 814, the wool bill (pp. 7847-8)(S. Doc. 68). The President objected to the import-control provision.
Later passed without amendment S. 1498, a new bill, which provides for wool-price supports at 1946 levels until Dec. 31, 1948, and permits CCC to dispose of its wool stocks below parity (pp. 7866-70). Rejected a McGrath amendment to limit the support period to June 30, 1948 (pp. 7869-70).
- 2. CROP INSURANCE.** The Agriculture and Forestry Committee reported with amendment S. 1326, to place the crop insurance program on a limited basis (S. Rept. 378) (p. 7840).
- 3. REMOUNT SERVICE.** The Armed Services Committee reported without amendment H. R. 3484, to transfer the Remount Service from the War Department to this Department (S. Rept. 357)(p. 7840).
- 4. CATTLE GRUBS.** The Agriculture and Forestry Committee reported without amendment S. 1249, to authorize research and eradication of cattle grubs (S. Rept. 363) (p. 7840).
- 5. RURAL ELECTRIFICATION.** The Agriculture and Forestry Committee reported without amendment S. 1087, which authorizes REA to refinance obligations of certain cities to TVA to the extent that such indebtedness was incurred with respect to rural-electrification systems (S. Rept. 362)(p. 7840).
- 6. RESEARCH LAND.** The Agriculture and Forestry Committee reported without amendment

H. R. 195, to authorize this Department to sell to Sitka, Alaska, a small tract formerly used as a site for agricultural research and weather service (S. Rept. 364)(p. 7840).

7. APPROPRIATIONS. The Rules and Administration Committee reported with amendments S. Con. Res. 6, to include all general appropriation bills in one consolidated general appropriation bill (S. Rept. 391)(p. 7840).
8. AGRICULTURAL INVESTIGATION. The Rules and Administration Committee reported with amendments S. Con. Res. 11, creating a joint committee to investigate certain matters affecting agriculture (S. Rept. not listed)(p. 7840).
9. CORPORATIONS. Received from the President a proposed amendment to the "general provisions" in the Government corporations budget for 1948 (S. Doc. 67); to Appropriations Committee (p. 7838). (Summary of this item will be in next Digest.)
10. FORESTRY. Received a Fla. Legislature resolution commending Forest Service for the manner in which it has activated and maintained the Apalachicola National Forest in Liberty County, Fla. (p. 7839).
11. RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION. Senate conferees were appointed on S. J. Res. 135, to continue RFC (pp. 7842-5).
12. AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL. Sen. Umstead, N. C., criticized cuts in items for ACP, SCS, research, FS, REA, FHA, and school lunches in the House bill (pp. 7874-7).
13. FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE. Sen. Hatch, N. Mex., inserted a telegram from the N. Mex. Cattle Growers' Association favoring additional funds for the campaign against this disease (p. 7877).
14. APPROPRIATIONS INVESTIGATIONS. Agreed to S. Res. 130 and 129, which, as amended, provide a total of \$60,000 additional for the Senate Appropriations Committee's investigations (p. 7877).
15. FLOOD CONTROL. Sen. Murray, Mont., spoke in favor of additional flood-control appropriations, mentioning the corn-crop situation as a result of floods and stating that flood damage thus interferes with foreign relief and contributes to high prices (pp. 7879-81).

HOUSE

16. LEGISLATIVE APPROPRIATION BILL. The Appropriations Committee reported this bill, H. R. 3993 (H. Rept. 717)(p. 7929). The bill includes funds for GPO, Library of Congress, Botanic Garden, Legislative Counsel, committee staffs, etc. The Committee report (1) indicates an intention of filling all committee-staff positions authorized by the Legislative Reorganization Act but not necessarily at the maximum salaries; (2) says the Coordinator of Information is "to provide the House with a nonpartisan, unprejudiced operation of digesting the mass of information which comes in to Members"; (3) questions the desirability of further increases in Library of Congress pending congressional decision as to whether the Library is to serve only Congress and the Government agencies or is to operate as a national library; (4) asks the Library to make a closer check of use of study rooms and tables by "scholars and researchers, including representatives of government agencies";

PROVIDING SUPPORT FOR WOOL

JUNE 26 (legislative day, APRIL 21), 1947.—Ordered to be printed

Mr. AIKEN, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry,
submitted the following

R E P O R T

[To accompany S. 1498]

The Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1498) to provide support for wool, and for other purposes, having considered the same, report thereon with a recommendation that it do pass without amendment.

Full and complete hearings were conducted by the committee earlier in the session on similar legislation, and it is the opinion of the committee that the producers of wool are entitled to price-support operations now accorded to the producers of other farm commodities under existing legislation.

○

S. 1498

[Report No. 377]

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

JUNE 26 (legislative day, APRIL 21), 1947

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming introduced the following bill; which was read twice and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

JUNE 26 (legislative day, APRIL 21), 1947

Reported by Mr. AIKEN, without amendment; considered, read the third time, and passed

A BILL

To provide support for wool, and for other purposes.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That (a) the Commodity Credit Corporation shall con-
4 tinue, until December 31, 1948, to support a price to
5 producers of wool in the continental United States and
6 Territories at the price it supported wool in 1946.

7 (b) Notwithstanding any other provisions hereof, the
8 Commodity Credit Corporation may adjust support prices
9 for individual grades and qualities of wool for the purpose
10 of bringing about a fair and equitable relationship in the
11 support prices for the various grades and qualities of wool;

1 and may make discounts from support prices for off-quality,
2 inferior-grade, or poorly prepared wool.

3 SEC. 2. The provisions of sections 385, 386, and 388
4 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended,
5 shall be applicable to the support operations carried out
6 pursuant to the first section of this Act.

7 SEC. 3. The Commodity Credit Corporation may, until
8 December 31, 1948, dispose of wool owned by it without
9 regard to any restriction imposed upon it by law.

[Report No. 377]

A BILL

To provide support for wool, and for other purposes.

By Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming

JUNE 26 (legislative day, APRIL 21), 1947

Read twice and referred to the Committee on
Agriculture and Forestry

JUNE 26 (legislative day, APRIL 21), 1947

Reported without amendment; considered, read the
third time, and passed

as the emergency is over—and I will leave it to the distinguished Senator—we shall forget it; we shall not change it; and then it will go on and on, and nothing will be done about it. The next time perhaps the situation will be reversed. But certainly no one can dispute the fact that the Speaker of the House of Representatives is closer to the people than is any other elective officer. I believe we could get an agreement on that. Whether he has the ability some other person has is another question; but his long service of apprenticeship, the fact that he is elected every 2 years, the fact that he is elected by the entire membership of the Congress, ought to be convincing evidence that there is no other elected officer that is closer to the people. Certainly he is closer than an appointed officer, than the Secretary of State, or the Secretary of the Treasury, or whoever might be named.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I will yield to the minority leader.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Speaker of the House may be closer to the Members of the House than any other officer in the Government, but he cannot be any closer to the people, because he represents only one district, just as any other Representative does.

Mr. WHERRY. I have covered that.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator covered that?

Mr. WHERRY. Yes,

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not know whether the Senator covered it correctly or not. I was called out of the Chamber at the time the Senator covered it. I may uncover it when I come to my remarks. Has the Senator discussed, or has anybody argued, whether the pending bill solves this problem: The Constitution of the United States requires the President of the United States to be native born and 35 years of age. The Constitution does not require the Speaker of the House either to be native born or 35 years of age. The Constitution does not even require him to be a Member of the House.

Mr. WHERRY. If the Senator will yield, it is unnecessary to go into that argument. On page 6, line 18, in the first subsection, it is provided that he must be qualified to be President of the United States.

Mr. BARKLEY. In other words, if the Speaker of the House is not 35, and is not native born, then the bill is a nullity so far as he is concerned?

Mr. WHERRY. Yes; the office then passes on to the next in line, the President pro tempore.

Mr. BARKLEY. The President pro tempore can come into the Senate at the age of 30, and he does not have to be native born. He is required to be 30 years of age. It is provided in the bill that he must be qualified. So, if the House should elect an unqualified Speaker, and if the Senate should elect an unqualified President pro tempore, neither of them could become President?

Mr. WHERRY. It would then go to the Secretary of State. This is exactly correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. Then the succession would finally pass to the Secretary of State, as the third in line?

Mr. WHERRY. The situation described by the minority leader would never happen.

Mr. BARKLEY. Perhaps that is so; but, under the Constitution, it could happen?

Mr. WHERRY. Yes; it could happen temporarily, only, because it would take but a very few minutes for the House to elect a new Speaker if the Speaker did not qualify or if he resigned. The Senate could do the same thing with the President pro tempore; or, if he did not qualify, then the Secretary of State could continue to act as President until the President pro tempore qualified.

Mr. BARKLEY. During those few minutes, when the House would have to discharge its Speaker and reelect one, who would be President?

Mr. WHERRY. The Secretary of State.

Mr. BARKLEY. He could be President, then, for a few minutes, and then the House would unhorse him?

Mr. WHERRY. He would serve only for the emergency. The bill provides that there shall be no time when there will not be an officer eligible to become President of the United States, and we are having difficulty now with that very provision.

The bill provides that whenever a Speaker becomes qualified, he is the first in the line of succession. If he cannot qualify according to the terms of the Constitution, the people would not want him as President of the United States, even though he were a Member of the House of Representatives.

Mr. BARKLEY. They absolutely would not. I would not want him as President, anyhow.

Mr. WHERRY. If he were unable to qualify, then the next in line would be the President pro tempore. I cannot conceive of either a Speaker or a President pro tempore serving in that office who would not qualify as President of the United States. But if he did not qualify, then the Secretary of State would be called upon to serve during the emergency, or until either the Speaker or the President pro tempore could qualify to act as President of the United States.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I would like to ask a question, as a matter of interest. As I understand, under the Constitution there are certain age requirements and residence requirements for both Senators and Members of the House of Representatives. Is there any law whatever that makes provision for any requirements as to the qualifications of the Secretary of State, who is an appointee of the President?

Mr. WHERRY. None whatever.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I will answer the question: none whatever.

Mr. HATCH. I did not want to answer that question.

Mr. WHERRY. If the Senator will pardon me, I wanted to answer the question asked by the Senator from Connecticut, and I would like to say, with all the force that is in me, that there is none whatever. I want to thank the Senator for bringing that to my attention. One more thing, the Secretary of State and the Secretary of the Treasury, and the Cabinet officers are not elected by the people; they are appointed. How anyone can say that there is a defect in the line of succession suggested in the bill, I just cannot understand, because the Speaker is closer to the people today than any other official.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. The Speaker is closer to the people, he is elected by the people, he is an elective officer, and the Secretary of State is not an elective officer. He is appointed, and he does not have any different qualifications than has the Speaker.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator, to ask one other question?

Mr. WHERRY. Yes; I am always glad to yield to the minority leader.

Mr. BARKLEY. In the event the President-elect and the Vice-President-elect should both die, after they have been elected by the electoral college, and before assuming the duties of office, in January, what would happen? There is no law that authorizes the reassembling of the electoral college. They are like the salmon, to which I referred the other day; they spawn, and they die. The electoral college elects a President, and then it dies, and nobody has power to reconvene it. If both the President-elect and the Vice-President-elect should die, what would happen?

Mr. WHERRY. The provision in the bill, which I think answers the question, will be found on page 4, beginning with line 19, that, in the event a President fails to qualify, or a Vice President fails to qualify, then the succession goes to the Speaker. It goes to the Speaker, then to the President pro tempore, then to the Secretary of State.

Mr. BARKLEY. Suppose the Congress has expired.

Mr. WHERRY. If the Congress had expired, and if there were no Speaker, and if it should happen that there were no President pro tempore of the Senate, then under the provisions of the bill the Secretary of State would become the acting President until such disability or disqualification was removed.

Mr. BARKLEY. The bill provides that the position of acting President shall finally come to the Secretary of State, but it makes it just as hard as possible for the Secretary of State to become acting President. Everyone else has to die before the succession comes to him.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Kentucky raises technical points which may never arise. The bill provides for protection against every emergency that can be conceived of so that organized civil government shall continue.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am not asking these questions facetiously. I am asking them because I believe there are many gaps in the whole situation which, fortu-

nately, we have never had to bridge, but which ought to be considered, so that all the holes and all the gaps to a legitimate succession to the Presidency may be closed, either before an individual takes his office or after he takes his office, and it seems to me that instead of bringing before the Senate a bill which contains piecemeal legislation, the whole question ought to be gone into and investigated by the committees of the Senate in order that we may fill every gap that may conceivably exist in respect to an emergency or exigency such as exist at present.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I have the highest regard for the Minority Leader, and I believe I have several times this afternoon answered the points raised by him. I agree that there is no perfect piece of legislation. I suppose there may be some gaps which are not provided for by the pending bill. I want the distinguished Senator to know, however, that the bill does not represent piecemeal legislation. To begin with, the bill contains the legislation recommended by the President of the United States.

Mr. BARKLEY. I may say at that point that I was opposed to the proposal when the Democrats were in power. I was opposed to it when the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN] was Speaker of the House, and when the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR] was President pro tempore of the Senate. I was opposed to the proposal then just as I am opposed to it now. So no one can accuse me of having any political bias in regard to it.

Mr. WHERRY. I have not accused the distinguished minority leader of anything.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator is getting ready to. [Laughter.]

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I see the Senator from Vermont is in his seat. I know what he wants to propose. I have a matter which I am anxious to speak of, but I would rather the Senator from Vermont were allowed to proceed now. I can take up my matter later.

Mr. WHERRY. Very well. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Vermont, providing the legislation he wishes to propose is not controversial. I have been very lenient, I will say, in connection with my presentation respecting the succession bill. I want to accommodate every Senator. I deeply appreciate the questions that have been asked respecting the succession bill, of which I have made a considerable study. If in any respects the legislation can be improved, we shall be very glad to attempt to do so. I am satisfied that the legislation has been carefully analyzed and studied. We have carefully analyzed the exhaustive study and work done by the Senate Committee on the Judiciary in 1856; we have carefully analyzed the work of the committee in 1886. Our research men and our counsel and the committee members have carefully analyzed the changes that have resulted from the adoption of the lame-duck amendment, which changes com-

pletely the status of the office of the Speaker and President pro tempore during the years for which they are elected.

I think the bill provides a complete answer to the question as to what line of succession is needed in order to continue an orderly Government, with a possible definition of disability. The matter of disability was not contained in the provisions of the law of 1792, was not contained in the law of 1836. Until someone can satisfactorily define what a disability is, and draft provisions to compel a person having a disability to vacate an office to which he is elected, even though he thinks he is not suffering from any disability, I think a constitutional question will exist, one which has not been solved. But I am satisfied that aside from the question of disability, the matter is handled fairly well in the bill before us, that is, that a Speaker does not have to resign, or that a President pro tempore does not have to resign, if he feels in his own mind that the disability is only temporary. I think that making the decision optional with the Speaker and the President pro tempore practically solves the question of disability.

As I said before, never in the history of the country have we had to make a decision of that kind. The matter of disability is not a part of this particular legislation in connection with Presidential succession. I agree, however, with the distinguished Senator from New Mexico that it is a perplexing problem.

I shall be glad to yield to the distinguished Senator from Vermont with the understanding that the matter which he proposes to bring up will not be controversial and consume any considerable length of time.

SUPPORT FOR WOOL

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, I ask unanimous consent to report Senate bill 1498, to provide support for wool, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the report is received.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, this new bill, ordered by the committee to be favorably reported, provides for support for wool at the 1946 support price. It gives the Commodity Credit Corporation authority to dispose of the accumulated wool stocks, amounting to some 450,000,000 pounds, at less than parity, if it is found necessary to do so.

The President's veto message on the wool bill was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. The committee met at 2:30 by permission of the Senate. It was decided it would be futile to attempt to pass the legislation over the President's veto. Therefore, no action was taken on the veto. Instead the committee voted unanimously to report favorably Senate bill 1498, introduced by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON].

The bill contains just two provisions. It puts a support price on wool equal to the 1946 support price, until December 31, 1948, and permits the Commodity Credit Corporation to dispose of the stocks on hand at whatever price they

have to sell them for in order to get rid of them.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CAIN in the chair). The bill will be reported by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 1498) to provide support for wool, and for other purposes.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. Senate bill 1498 is a bill to provide support for wool. The President today vetoed the wool bill, which was the result of the conference between certain members of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and certain members of the House Committee on Agriculture, and agreed to by both the House and the Senate recently. The new bill, S. 1498, is the same as the conference report with one exception, that is, that section 4 of the conference report bill has been omitted from Senate bill 1498. The new bill accepts the House amendment to the support price provision of the Senate bill. The Senate bill carried a support price of not less than the price paid in 1946. The House amended that by striking out the words "not less than" and merely inserting the price of 1946.

The only other provision in which there is any change from the original Senate bill, which was amended slightly by the House, is in section 3 of Senate bill 1498. The original Senate bill provided that:

The Commodity Credit Corporation may, without regard to restrictions imposed upon it by any law, dispose of any wool produced prior to January 1, 1949, at prices which will permit such wool to be sold in competition with imported wool. The disposition of any accumulated stock under the provisions of this section, however, shall be made at such rate and in such manner as will avoid disruption of the domestic market.

That was in the original Senate bill 814. Section 3 of the new bill is the House amendment, which reads:

The Commodity Credit Corporation may, until December 31, 1948, dispose of wool owned by it without regard to any restrictions imposed upon it by law.

Those are the only differences between the new bill and the original Senate bill 814.

Section 4 has been omitted. It was because of that section, Mr. President, that the President of the United States said, in his veto message, he was forced to veto the bill. That was a provision giving the President the option to impose import fees or quotas on the importation of wool.

I do not think there is any need for me to say anything more. I hope the Senate will accept the bill, as some such bill is most urgently required. The shearing of the 1947 wool clip is already 80 percent completed. Most of the wool is lying sacked in warehouses all over the country. In many instances the small producer has been forced to sell his clip at some 10 to 15 cents below the price he would receive under this meas-

ure. It is an urgent measure, and I again remind the Senate that wool is a critical material. That was brought home to me forcibly this morning when I was sitting as a member of the subcommittee considering the War Department appropriation bill, and we heard the representatives of the National Guard crying for new uniforms. They said they needed 300,000 woolen uniforms for the troops. I could not help thinking that if our domestic wool producers were put out of business, as they might well be unless we have some legislation to keep them in business, the result, in case of war, might be disastrous.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and the Senator from Wyoming have discussed this bill with me. I shall not object to its consideration at this time. However, I should like to point out that there are several factors concerning the bill which I believe do not make for the best type of legislation.

As the Senator from Wyoming has stated, the bill does three things. First, it sets the price of domestic wool at the minimum of the prices obtained in the year 1946. Second, it permits the Commodity Credit Corporation to buy wool at this price until December 31, 1948—

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield to me?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. The Senator from Massachusetts said "at the minimum of the prices obtained in the year 1946." It is at the 1946 prices.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is what I intended to say.

Second, it permits the Commodity Credit Corporation to buy wool until December 31, 1948, at the 1946 prices. Third, it permits the Commodity Credit Corporation to sell the wool it has on hand at less than it cost the Commodity Credit Corporation.

I respectfully point out that the bill in effect does three things. First, it puts and keeps the Government in the domestic wool market. In reality, it makes the Government the sole buyer of the domestic wool crop unless the price exceeds the price of 1946. Secondly, it is the only commodity, I believe, which the Government buys at a price greater than parity. That is a new formula for Government purchases of commodities. Third, I wish to point out that it puts the cost of clothing, so far as wool is concerned, at a high price, and will maintain it there.

It is fair to say that the prices of wool today are high. It is fair to say that the price of wool is substantially above the 1946 levels. But this bill means that that price will be obtained until December 1948 and that if the prices fall off at all, the Government must stay in the wool market and become the purchaser of wool which is produced domestically. It will then sell such wool at a loss in order to compete with the foreign market.

For these reasons we who come from Massachusetts, where the wool trade is

to a large extent concentrated, and where there are large textile mills, certainly do not like this bill. But the Senate has debated it in full in the past. We have stated our objections. The bill is substantially the bill which the Senate originally passed. That bill was amended in the House to include the tariff provision, and with the tariff provision the bill has now been vetoed.

For these reasons I shall not object to unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill. However, I still say that if I had my way the bill would not become law in its present form.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. There is one thing which I should like to mention in connection with the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL]. He referred to the high prices of wool clothing. I wonder if the Senator realizes how little wool there is in a suit of clothes. Take, for example, a three-piece suit of clothes of the finest wool, heavy weight, winter clothing. At the outside, the total weight of wool in that suit is 2½ pounds. If the support price were doubled and the manufacturers had to pay double the price they pay today, it could not increase the price of the Senator's suit more than \$1.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, there is nothing in the bill but what has been considered and overwhelmingly approved by the Senate earlier in the session. For that reason I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to point out that when we pass this bill it is not so much a question of the cost of this particular piece of legislation as it is a question of establishing the precedent of guaranteeing to one group of farmers for 2 years the highest prices which they received for their commodities during wartime. We now have on the statute books laws guaranteeing prices on certain basic commodities, according to a parity formula. This proposal exceeds that. Other groups of farmers now under the parity formula have just as much right to ask the Government to guarantee 125 or 150 percent of parity as do the wool producers.

Also, at least one-third of our agriculture is not under any support program at all, but is on a free market. To me it is not fair to pick out one small group of farmers and try to enact legislation to take care of them at the expense of the rest of the country.

During recent years much has been said on both sides of the aisle about returning to a free-enterprise system. If we pass this bill, we shall be entirely eliminating all the wool buyers of the country and placing the purchase of wool entirely in the hands of the Government, as was pointed out by the Sen-

ator from Massachusetts. Therefore, at this time I object to unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. HATCH. Do I correctly understand that objection was made?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands that the Senator from Delaware registered an objection.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I was hopeful that no objection would be made. I wish now to express my thanks to the Senator from Vermont and other members of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry for the sympathy with which they have treated this subject, and the promptness with which they have acted. I trust that the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] will make a motion at the earliest possible moment to take up this bill and dispose of it.

Mr. AIKEN. I can assure the Senator from New Mexico that I would make such a motion, but I do not care to impose upon the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] and ask him to yield for that purpose.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to comply with the Senator's request.

Mr. AIKEN. The small wool growers of the West will have to continue to be at the mercy of the speculators.

The Government has supported other commodities at higher-than-parity prices. All during the war it supported poultry at higher-than-parity prices. It has supported dairy products at higher-than-parity prices. It has supported other commodities. We are not singling out wool.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I understand that the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] is willing to yield to me at this time for the purpose of making a motion to proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 1498.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I do not wish to be in the position of holding up the wool growers of western Nebraska. I think I have been as lenient as anyone could be with my time. I have yielded time and again for more than 10 days. I have permitted other legislation to displace the unfinished business.

We have a unanimous-consent agreement to vote tomorrow afternoon at 2 o'clock. I feel that Members of the Senate ought to be able to read my speech in the RECORD. I am convinced that we should enact the pending legislation. I do not wish to be placed in the position tomorrow afternoon at 2 o'clock of having Senators say, "We have not had ample time to discuss this question." I am perfectly agreeable to permitting the Senate to do what it wishes to do, but I do not want Members of the Senate to be under any misapprehension when the vote comes tomorrow. I do not want the impression to be gained that I have in any way delayed consideration of the succession bill.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I suggest that if the motion is made now, in all probability it will be agreed to. There seems to be a disposition on the part of all Senators except the Senator who objected to allow the bill to be considered. I hope the Senator from Nebraska will yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield for a question?

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator from Nebraska has the floor.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield to me for a question?

Mr. WHERRY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I wish to propound a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. As I understand, the only question pending is a unanimous-consent request for the present consideration of the bill. My question is this: If the wool bill is taken up by unanimous consent, will those of us who do not like it have an opportunity to vote "no" on the passage of the bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. AIKEN obtained the floor.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, if I have the floor, before yielding to the Senator from Delaware I wish to say that when it comes to a matter of saving money, the United States Government has probably \$170,000,000 tied up in 460,000,000 pounds of wool. That wool could be released and made available for use if we could only pass this bill.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I have no objection whatever to the Senate considering the bill. However, I do not want it done under a unanimous-consent agreement for a vote on the passage of the bill. If the Senate wishes to consider the bill at this time, I am not planning to delay its passage, if the Senator will make a motion to bring the bill before the Senate.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WHERRY. There is a unanimous-consent request to take up this particular bill. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Vermont if it involves final passage of the bill this afternoon?

Mr. AIKEN. It does.

Mr. WHERRY. Then am I correct in thinking it would require a quorum call before unanimous consent is made?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is informed that a quorum call will be required if final passage to the bill is intended this afternoon.

Mr. AIKEN. Then, Mr. President, I move that the pending business be temporarily laid aside and the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Senate bill 1498.

Mr. BARKLEY. It seems to me that the ruling of the Chair is a little different from what it should have been. If unanimous consent is given for consideration of the bill by unanimous con-

sent it does not thereafter require a roll call to pass it, or even a quorum call, unless some Senator makes the point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] incorporated in his unanimous-consent request a declaration of intention to pass the bill today.

Mr. BARKLEY. It was a mere declaration of intention, but it was not a part of the unanimous-consent request, as I understand it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understood that it was a part of the unanimous-consent request.

Mr. BARKLEY. That would be fixing a definite time for a vote, which would require a quorum call, unless it were waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont, as the Chair understands, can withdraw the unanimous-consent request in the form in which he entered it.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, inasmuch as the unanimous-consent request was not granted, anyway, I subsequently made the motion that the pending business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 1498. I do not know of any protracted speeches which are to be made for or against the bill. It seems to me that we can get a vote on it so that those who want to keep their record of opposition clear would have a chance to make that record in a very short time.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, it seems to me that we might vote on it without any further discussion, and it can probably be passed, as it was passed before, without much delay.

A parliamentary inquiry. If it is done by way of motion, will it or will it not set aside, not temporarily, but set aside, the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It would set aside the pending business until 12 o'clock tomorrow. But there is nothing to prevent the pending business, which then would be set aside, from being taken up again this afternoon.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, as I understand the parliamentary situation, the motion made by the Senator from Vermont would only displace the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is the Chair's understanding.

Mr. WHERRY. And when it is concluded the Senate will return to the pending business.

Mr. BARKLEY. Why can we not vote on it now?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands the motion of the Senator from Vermont to be that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 1498.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1498) to provide support for wool, and for other purposes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, there is one statement which I should like to correct, and that is the statement of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] in relation to the support price enjoyed by poultry farmers. I should like to call to his attention the fact that poultry farm-

ers do not enjoy a support price at all on broilers. The support price on other poultry is the lowest of any support price on any of the basic commodities. In the western States farmers enjoy some support price on their fowls, but in the East there is no support price on poultry, or turkeys, nor has it ever been requested. Wool is the only agricultural product to my knowledge which has ever had a support price so far in excess of parity level. In other words, we are asked to establish a precedent if we pass the wool bill.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield for a question on that point?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. THYE. Is not this an aftermath of the war condition?

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is true.

Mr. THYE. It is a situation brought about by the war?

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is true but the same situation exists as to other agricultural products.

Mr. THYE. It is a situation brought about by the fact that the waters around Great Britain were blocked because of the war, and the wool coming from Australia had to come to the United States. Then, because there was need for a high inventory of wool, Great Britain as well as the United States built a large inventory. With the ending of the war we commenced to market that wool. Great Britain's high inventory came to the United States just a few cents under our own domestic wool price, with the result that the Commodity Credit Corporation's holding of domestic wool was left on the shelf, and the imported wool took the market day by day, month by month. We must either pass legislation like this or we shall have a situation in which we have 460,000,000 pounds of wool going on the market at the level at which it is today, and as the market becomes depressed because of that huge volume, the Federal Government will be holding indefinitely the wool which the Commodity Credit Corporation now has.

So I say again to the Senator that it is an aftermath of the war, and we might as well pass the legislation now. We do not want to break every man in the sheep business. Unless we want to break them we should pass this legislation.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I thank the Senator from Minnesota. He has said that the situation is an aftermath of the war. But the war was a world-wide affair and all of the farmers in the United States participated in it. I cannot understand why he should suggest that we select one group of farmers and propose to extend to them for two more years war-time prices for their crop, when we are not supporting this other group of farmers either at parity or at cost of production. Under this bill we would be supporting the price of wool at the highest price in the history of the wool industry.

Mr. THYE. If the Senator will yield for another question—

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. THYE. The Senator will admit that the price is not an unjust or unfair price because it happens to be parity. We find ourselves, after the ending of the

war, with a situation which the war brought about, when we had to have a high inventory of wool on tap. Because of the condition in which Great Britain found itself at the conclusion of the war, with approximately 2,000,000,000 pounds of wool on hand, it placed that wool on our market, which compelled our producers to go to the Commodity Credit Corporation, and the Commodity Credit Corporation had to buy the wool and maintain parity for the wool producer. That is why the Commodity Credit Corporation has the 460,000,000 pounds of wool today.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Senator is perfectly right. The reason that we have 460,000,000 pounds of wool is because the Commodity Credit Corporation was buying wool at an artificially high price, and as the Senator pointed out also, Australia was putting wool on this market at just a few cents below the price which was fixed, and as a result most of the woolen mills in the country, instead of using American wool, were using British wool, which we were buying at 1 or 2 cents below the high price established. The result is that we have 400,000,000 or 500,000,000 pounds of wool, or enough to last us almost a year, and we are still using British wools, to a large extent. To correct this situation, as I see it, it is proposed that we continue for 18 months in the same direction, hoping that something will happen in the meantime whereby we can correct a situation which was brought about by the same piece of legislation which it is now proposed we extend.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. The Senator has stated that there is a stock pile of approximately 1 year's consumption in the United States. The consumption in the United States this year is around 1,000,000,000 pounds, and it was approximately that last year. Of that 1,000,000,000 pounds, 800,000,000 pounds is being shipped in from foreign countries.

Mr. WILLIAMS. But a large proportion of that which is included in consumption is reexported.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. No; that is the consumption in this country.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] quoted the figures from the Department of Agriculture last week when we discussed the bill. At that time I placed in the RECORD figures showing that we were importing and consuming foreign wool at inflated prices while our own wool was backing up in storage. That condition is economically unsound.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. The consumption of domestic wool and imported wool in the United States had for many years not been below 600,000,000 pounds. We ourselves were producing 450,000,000 pounds before the war, but owing to the conditions which exist and which this bill is designed to remedy, the wool-producing industry in this country dropped from 450,000,000 pounds to approximately 300,000,000 pounds. This

bill is designed to try to bring about the figure which prevailed in prewar days.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Does the Senator from Wyoming feel that we can offer a reasonable explanation to the other farmers as to why we cannot guarantee to them a price similar to that?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am ready to yield the floor in a few minutes.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator from Delaware asked a question as to what explanation could be given to the other farmers of the United States. The explanation is entirely simple. With respect to no other agricultural product have we the situation which exists with respect to wool. The British Government has established a state monopoly for the sale of British-produced wool in the United States, and unless this bill is passed we shall be condemning the individual wool producers of the United States to competition with the British state monopoly, a selling monopoly that exists with respect to no other agricultural commodity. It is a complete justification for the action which we ask.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I want to ask the Senator from Wyoming this question. When the President vetoed the legislation which was sent to him recently, did he not veto the instrument by which we might prevent the situation which the Senator is discussing?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. When the President vetoed the bill he said that if it were in the form in which it had been introduced by my colleague, he would have signed it. So we hope the Senator will permit the Senate to proceed on that basis.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I have no intention of blocking the consideration of the bill at this time. I shall vote against the bill because I think it would have a highly undesirable effect, for it does establish a precedent of taking care of one group of farmers at wartime prices for their product, while at the same time other groups of farmers would be operating in a free market.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I shall not delay the Senate for more than 2 minutes further. I merely wish to say that I oppose this bill and shall vote against it for the reasons I have already stated, and for the additional reason that I believe it will result, as the Senator from Delaware has pointed out, in a very substantial cost to the Government. How many millions of dollars it will cost the Government no one can say at the present time, because no one knows what will be the price of wool in the next year and a half. But presumably the 460,000,000-plus pounds of domestic wool which is in the hands of the Government will have to be sold, and a substantial amount will have to be sold at a loss.

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague [Mr. GREEN] and myself, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. In line 4, it is proposed to strike out "December 31, 1948", and insert "June 30, 1948."

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. President, it seems to me that this bill, which again is hurriedly brought before us, is at best a matter of extreme controversy between two forces that are materially affected by it, namely, the producers of wool, on the one hand, and the manufacturers who use wool, on the other hand. I come from a section of the country where the product of the wool growers is used in manufacturing. We are advised by our folks that this support legislation is unnecessary and undesirable. The Senator from Massachusetts has expressed his opinion regarding his constituents, and I may say that ours are similarly situated.

It seems to me that since we are dealing with something that is of an emergency nature, we would be dealing quite fairly if we were to pass support legislation which would take care of the wool growers until June 30, 1948. The Congress will be in session again beginning in January 1948, and it will then have ample time to look into the supply situation, the price situation, the views of the growers, and the views of the manufacturers.

So it seems to me that it would be only a fair compromise of an issue which is highly controversial, to say the least, for us to set the date of termination of this support price measure as of June 30, 1948, instead of December 31, 1948. Therefore, I have offered the amendment.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I desire to say, briefly, that I am fearful that the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. McGRATH] and his colleague [Mr. GREEN] have not read the bill. The amendment will not in the slightest degree affect the price at which the manufacturers of Rhode Island may purchase wool, because one of the principal portions of this measure is to be found in section 3, reading as follows:

The Commodity Credit Corporation may, until December 31, 1948, dispose of wool owned by it without regard to any restriction imposed upon it by law.

The effect of that provision is that the Commodity Credit Corporation may sell this wool competitively with foreign wool, so that the price of the foreign wool will govern the price at which the Commodity Credit Corporation disposes of the domestic wool, and the manufacturers of New England will not be injured in that respect at all.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Certainly.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like to point out to the Senator the statement he made just a few minutes ago about the English trading corporation. I most respectfully disagree with what the Senator has just said; and I do so for the following reason, and I should like to ask the Senator whether there is merit in it: If the domestic price of wool is held up to the 1946 value, and if one foreign corporation controlled by the English authorities is trading with us, obviously

they will keep their price higher than they would if there were a free market, and if the domestic supply sold at a lower price.

We do not want to take a floor away from the domestic producers of wool. We in New England believe that certainly they should have a floor, but we do not believe that it should be so high that the prices of foreign products, as well as our own products, will be kept at an artificial level.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I say to the Senator from Massachusetts that there cannot be a free market as long as the British selling monopoly exists, so that portion of the Senator's argument is out.

With respect to the second portion of his argument, as I see it, let me say that the British selling monopoly will reduce its price in order to take whatever portion of the domestic market it can take; and under this bill the Commodity Credit Corporation will proceed to meet the reduction of the British selling monopoly, with the effect, in my judgment, that the manufacturers will receive a much better price than the one they are entitled to.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I wish to oppose the amendment offered by the Senator from Rhode Island. Its effect would be to give the Texas sheep growers the support price for 1948, but to deny it to the Montana sheep growers, because the Texas sheep growers would get their sheep sheared in time to get the wool to market before June 30, which is the date proposed by the amendment of the Senator from Rhode Island, but the Montana and Wyoming and the other Rocky Mountain wool growers, who do not finish shearing until June, would be denied the support price which the amendment would grant to growers in the more southern States. Therefore, I shall oppose the amendment.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I oppose the amendment offered by the Senator from Rhode Island. It seems to me that the entire question of the support program must be reviewed in 1948. The Steagall amendments, which provide parity for not only one commodity but many agricultural commodities, expire in 1948, so at that time that question must be reviewed. The Commodity Credit Corporation will expire in 1948, and at that time the entire question of the renewal of that Corporation, as well as the period of time during which its life shall be extended, must be examined and studied, and at that time we must reestablish it, if there is to be such legislation after the year 1948.

For that reason, it seems to me inconsistent to establish the date of termination of this particular support price as of June 30, when all the other support prices of the agricultural program are now established under different dates.

In view of the question which the able junior Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] raised once before about the support price on wool, let me say that there are support prices on many agricultural commodities. The Senator has in mind the more recent potato-support price, but in the near future he will hear much about the peanut-support price, and it concerns the Eastern States.

So I suggest that the amendment offered by the junior Senator from Rhode Island would be somewhat inconsistent with the entire agricultural program as now provided by the Steagall amendments.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I should like to say this about the amendment, that in the pending bill it is proposed to confer upon the Commodity Credit Corporation power to carry out the supporting of this product during all the next year. I should like to call attention to the fact that the Commodity Credit Corporation ceases to exist on June 30, 1948. I wonder what position we would be in with these conflicting dates.

Mr. THYE. It was extended to December 31.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I think that should be checked. I understood it was possibly June 30. Anyway, I considered what position we would be in if we were to extend this law until December, and, at the same time, the Commodity Credit Corporation ceases to exist on June 30. Could the Senator from Vermont answer that question?

Mr. THYE. If the Senator would care to have me answer that question, relative to the Commodity Credit Corporation, the Senate has passed the bill, and the House Banking Committee has reported it favorably today, so that there is no question that the bill will be passed, extending the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation until December 31, to comply with the provisions of the Steagall amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The truth of the matter is, we are conferring upon an agency which does not exist power to carry out the proposed law; is not that correct?

Mr. THYE. It would be hardly conceivable for me, as a Member of the Senate, that the Congress, having passed a measure under which the producer geared himself to the high production he attained in order to meet the war demands upon him, would fail to make possible a continuance of the provision of the Steagall amendment, that would assure Congress carrying out that which Congress undertook in previous acts.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am not suggesting that we would fail to do it, but I am merely suggesting that legislation is being proposed before that has been done. We have the cart before the horse.

Mr. AIKEN. The reason the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation was extended 1 year instead of 2 was that, under the law passed by Congress last year, the Commodity Credit Corporation is required to write and take out a Federal charter before July 1, 1948, and therefore it was impossible to extend it for more than 1 year.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Rhode Island.

The amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is still open for amendment. If there be no amendment, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, before the so-called wool legislation was taken up I was engaged in a discussion of the succession bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would like to suggest to the Senator from Nebraska that, because of the action that has just been taken, there is no pending business, and it is suggested to the Chair that the Senator from Nebraska should move to consider the succession bill.

PRESIDENTIAL SUCCESSION

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate now resume the consideration of Senate bill 564, the succession bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Nebraska.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 564) to provide for the performance of the duties of the office of President, in case of the removal, resignation, or inability both of the President and Vice President.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, prior to the consideration of the so-called wool bill, the minority leader propounded to me a question. During my attempt to answer the question, the Senator made a statement that I was about to accuse him of something, I am not sure what. I should like to say, as genially as possible, that I was not accusing the minority leader of anything, and that I protest the fact that he feels that he can read my mind. I was about to complete the answer to the question. I am sorry the Senator is not on the floor.

As I recall the Senator's question, it was this: If a President-elect and a Vice President-elect died, how would the Congress be convened? How would a Speaker and a President pro tempore be obtained to fill the office of President? I should like to point out to the distinguished Senator from Kentucky that, having considered the changes in the Constitution since 1886, eliminating those hurdles, I have in my prepared speech the answer to his question. But, because the Senator asked it at this point, I should like to answer, briefly.

Section 2 of the twentieth amendment to the Constitution provides:

The Congress shall assemble at least once in every year, and such meeting shall begin at noon on the 3d of January, unless they shall by law appoint a different day.

So that Congress now assembles on the 3d day of January. The Senate would be in session. Another thing that I want to state as a premise, before answering the Senator's question, is that a President would be serving as of January 3; because the Senator's query runs only to what would happen if a President-elect and a Vice President elect should die before qualifying, before taking office, but after their election.

A President performs the duties of the Presidency until when? Until January 20. So that, in the intervening time from January 3, when the Congress is assembled, the Senate, by rule of the Senate, under the twentieth amendment, on January 3, would become organized, and a President pro tempore would be elected.

80TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

S. 1498

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

JUNE 27, 1947

Referred to the Committee on Agriculture

AN ACT

To provide support for wool, and for other purposes.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

3 That (a) The Commodity Credit Corporation shall continue,
4 until December 31, 1948, to support a price to producers of
5 wool in the continental United States and Territories at the
6 price it supported wool in 1946.

7 (b) Notwithstanding any other provisions hereof, the
8 Commodity Credit Corporation may adjust support prices
9 for individual grades and qualities of wool for the purpose of
10 bringing about a fair and equitable relationship in the support
11 prices for the various grades and qualities of wool; and may

1 make discounts from support prices for off-quality, inferior-
2 grade, or poorly prepared wool.

3 SEC. 2. The provisions of sections 385, 386, and 388 of
4 the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, shall
5 be applicable to the support operations carried out pursuant
6 to the first section of this Act.

7 SEC. 3. The Commodity Credit Corporation may, until
8 December 31, 1948, dispose of wool owned by it without
9 regard to any restriction imposed upon it by law.

Passed the Senate June 26 (legislative day, April 21),
1947.

Attest:

CARL A. LOEFFLER,

Secretary.

80TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

S. 1498

AN ACT

To provide support for wool, and for other purposes.

JUNE 27, 1947

Referred to the Committee on Agriculture

toward sound solution of the problems which, even during the war, retarded the development of decent housing for minorities. Today, Negro as well as white developers are finding encouragement and assistance where heretofore they were met only with unsurmountable problems in building for these groups. Substantial construction programs using the resources of the Negro group are under way in Atlanta and Macon, Ga.; Nashville, Tenn.; New Orleans, La.; Chicago, Ill.; Lubbock, Tex.; and various other cities. At the same time white businessmen have spearheaded corporations for the development of housing to accommodate Negroes in such cities as Orlando, Fla.; Indianapolis, Ind.; and Rochester, N. Y.

Self-help characterizes many of these programs as, in the case of Macon, the corporation is comprised of Negro enterprisers, or, as in Indianapolis, the future occupants of the development are to assist in actual construction as a means of lowering costs and sharing in responsibility for the success of the venture.

In order to comprehend the amount of work involved in each case, it must be pointed out that careful follow-up by racial relations advisers is maintained in every stage of launching and completing a housing program. The initial step of identifying the market among Negroes, one of the key points in assuring private developers of a successful venture in this field, entails an operation of major proportion. This market has been identified in more than 30 localities through the cooperative efforts of the regional racial relations advisers and the regional economists. In several cities where public housing projects are located, the cooperation of the local housing authorities in making available lists of over-income public housing tenants had been used in these analyses. As a matter of fact, the executive directors of local housing authorities in several cities, such as Memphis, Tenn., and Dallas, Tex., have taken a leading role in pointing up the private enterprise market among Negro tenants in public housing projects for whom no standard housing is available in the community.

Following the market identification task is the most difficult job of locating acceptable sites where residency of minorities can be effected without encountering unsurmountable community resistance. This has been a major activity of racial relations advisers in at least half of the 120 cities where the developments are now planned or under way. It entails not only location of technically sound sites, approvable by the FHA and local planning bodies, and available at reasonable costs, but also "selling" these sites to the community and gaining support for their use by minorities.

In most cities, this means finding sites outside of the areas where minorities are concentrated or where only slum neighborhoods are customarily relinquished to such groups. The impact of this situation in northern cities like Detroit and Chicago, is common knowledge; and in southern cities like Baltimore, with 20 percent of its population confined to 2 percent of the land area; or like Atlanta, with one-third of the population in

less than a sixth of the land area, solution of this problem is regarded as the key to establishing sound racial relations.

The racial relations services continue throughout later stages of development with specific assistance in resolving such problems as finance, occupancy and compliance with FHA standards. Their extensive experience enables these advisers to identify pitfalls as well as sound approaches and assist in gaining understanding and cooperation between minority and majority groups to the mutual benefit of the entire community.

Public Affairs Pamphlet No. 128, Our Negro Veterans, just issued this year by the Public Affairs Committee, Inc., cites the race relations service of the National Housing Agency with these words:

The section under Dr. Horne's direction was a model of what services a Federal agency could offer minority veterans. It was reflected in a generally better record in housing for Negro veterans than other agencies could show in their fields. Only by recognizing the tendency toward discrimination can a Government agency ever satisfactorily meet the needs of those less privileged citizens. * * * It is to be hoped that the race relations service will continue in existence and become a model for other agencies.

WHAT THE HOUSING BUDGET CUTS MEAN

First. Administrative expense budgets of 21 corporations were cut \$14,800,000. Of that total, \$13,200,000 or practically 90 percent came out of the budgets of the constituents of the National Housing Agency.

Second. Federal Public Housing Authority:

(a) Administrative expense budget cut one-third, leaving the 1948 budget just about one-half that of 1947.

(b) Funds for annual Federal payments to make up the difference between the rents which the low-income tenants can pay and the cost of operating public housing projects were cut from \$7,200,000 to \$2,200,000. This means higher rents for the tenants or higher costs to the city.

Third. Federal Housing Administration, which requested an increase of 36 percent, received the same amount as for 1947.

Fourth. Office of Administrator, NHA, requested \$1,200,000 and was granted only \$100,000, which is less than the present cost of operating 1 month. This amount, arbitrarily set without reference to specific functions, is claimed by the committee as adequate to preserve the administrative and policy supervision of the Office of the Administrator for fiscal 1948. Actually, it is less than one-half the amount required even to liquidate the agency.

IF THIS HOUSE ACTION IS APPROVED BY THE SENATE

First. It means almost complete victory for the campaign of real estate and home-building lobbies to kill public housing and eliminate all Federal aids to bring decent housing within the reach of the masses of our people.

Second. The FPHA and Office of Administrator, the two housing agencies in which Negroes have gotten the best break are the hardest hit. In fact, the

future of the entire low-rent public-housing program and the Racial Relations Service is in dire jeopardy.

Third. The FHA, which has launched a program to open up the middle income housing market among Negroes to private enterprise, must restrict its operations and possibly lose the momentum built up this year.

Fourth. Republican leadership must bear the full responsibility for the wrecking of the housing agencies and programs which have meant most to the masses of Negroes.

WHAT THESE CUTS MEAN TO NEGROES

The Negro press has universally protested in news items, editorial, and special columnists the termination of the Racial Relations Service and the curtailment of housing programs which have meant so much to Negro people. In addition, the most representative voices among all racial groups have spoken.

Dr. Mary McLeod Bethune, president of the National Council of Negro Women, who is recognized by many to hold the place once held by the revered Booker T. Washington, writes:

Today we find that the housing agencies which have been most considerate of the housing needs of racial minorities are almost hopelessly crippled under the blow of unprecedented appropriation reductions. In the wake of the virtual elimination of the NHA Administrator's Office and the ruthless curtailment of funds for the FPHA, the entire Racial Relations Service is wiped out. This action robs 13,000,000 citizens of the guidance of those specialists who have given us hope and assistance in our struggle for an equal chance to obtain decent shelter.

Much of real value—

Writes Dr. F. D. Patterson, president of Tuskegee Institute—

has been accomplished in the way Federal housing programs have reached Negroes. This has unquestionably been due in large measure by the untiring and effective work of advisory personnel both in Washington and in the field.

He urges the continuation of these racial advisory services "in an area of need which is unsurpassed in its importance to the welfare of the Negro people and to the national well-being."

The National Urban League—

Says its general secretary, Eugene Kinkle Jones—

has for many years been close to the housing needs and problems of Negroes. We have found the racial relations staffs of the various housing agencies an absolute necessity for realistic and intelligent Government action in meeting these needs.

Roy Wilkins, executive secretary of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, speaking for 1,500 local chapters with over half a million members, states:

This association feels that, if the regional racial relations advisers are dropped, the whole program aimed at evolving a housing program in which minority groups will receive fair treatment will be seriously damaged, if not destroyed.

The Honorable James Kytte Williams, judge advocate of the American Legion, Department of Florida, writes:

We in Florida have set great store by the work of Dr. Horne and his regional staff in Atlanta. * * * Members of this staff

have done the processing and leg work in connection with one of the most important projects scheduled for many years. I refer, of course, to the project of replacing the slums of Miami and other portions of Dade County area with modern dwellings.

Bishop William Alfred Fountain wrote to the President:

As senior bishop of the African Methodist Episcopal Church and presiding bishop of the sixth Episcopal district, namely, the State of Georgia, I have had considerable opportunity to note carefully and evaluate the services of the racial relations adviser in this region. Through my constituency of over one thousand ministers and a State-wide membership in excess of one hundred thousand members, I have been informed of several instances of services rendered to local communities during the recent war emergency and particularly during the present postwar housing crisis wherein local councils working with the Federal Housing Administration through the efforts of the racial relations adviser are planning and building developments which will alleviate in part the tragic housing problem faced by all our citizens but most particularly Negroes.

A group of white business leaders in Orlando, Fla., representing Rotary, Kiwanis, banking and real-estate interests who have set up a nonprofit corporation to help colored citizens to acquire land and develop a modern housing project in Orlando states:

Al Thompson, of the Atlanta office of the National Housing Agency, and Dr. Horne, of the Washington Office, both being members of the Negro race and having to do with regional racial relations have been most helpful in developing this project, which we believe to be the outstanding attempt to solve this problem ever to be made in this country.

Willard S. Townsend, international president of the United Transport and Service Employees, stated to the President:

I strongly believe that not only Negroes themselves, but all the genuinely progressive people within and without the ranks of labor, had observed the housing gains of racial minorities motivated by the racial relations service. They will not be able to understand the Government's sudden and arbitrary disposition of this service while the housing shortage so distinctly remains and the particularized difficulty of housing racial minorities remains even more vexatious.

Rev. W. H. Jernagin, director, Fraternal Council of Negro Churches in America, representing 11 denominations with more than 7,000,000 members, writes:

As spiritual leaders in the community we know how important it is to our family life for our people to have decent homes in which to live and bring up their children. Our affiliated councils and their members have grown to depend upon the Racial Relations Service for assistance and guidance in the formulation and execution of local plans to make more and adequate housing available to racial minority groups in all income levels. * * * It is indeed a shock to us, who have been looking hopefully to the administration and the Congress for an expanded program of aids to assist in solving our housing problems to find instead that we are being disarmed by the removal of the services so vitally needed during the current housing emergency.

WHAT MUST BE DONE

In order that these minority groups and all people interested in their progress and the well-being of the Nation may not feel that the Government of the United States has turned its back upon the pressing housing needs of the underprivileged, it is mandatory that the Republican majority, supported by those of us on the minority side, join in effecting the following results:

First. Restoration by the Senate of the 1948 budget requests of the Office of the Administrator of the National Housing Agency and of the Federal Public Housing Authority, the Federal Housing Administration and the Federal Home Loan Bank Administration.

Second. Continuation of the Racial Relations Service and personnel to assure the necessary teamwork between the building industry and Government can concentrate their joint resources upon meeting the housing needs of all elements of the population and of all income groups.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BUCHANAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. SCHWABE of Missouri asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article by David Lawrence.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

~~S. 1070. An act to provide for the cancellation of the capital stock of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation and the refund of moneys received for such stock, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.~~

S. 1498. An act to provide support for wool, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 1742. An act for the relief of Mary Lomas;

H. R. 3303. An act to stimulate volunteer enlistments in the Regular Military Establishment of the United States;

H. R. 3398. An act to extend the period of validity of the act to facilitate the admission into the United States of the alien fiancées or fiancés of members of the armed forces of the United States;

H. R. 3611. An act to fix and regulate the salaries of teachers, school officers, and other employees of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3911. An act to continue temporary authority of the Maritime Commission until March 1, 1948; and

H. J. Res. 193. Joint resolution to grant authority for the erection of a permanent building for the American National Red Cross, District of Columbia Chapter, Washington, D. C.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to a joint resolution of the Senate of the following title:

S. J. Res. 125. Joint resolution to strengthen the common defense and to meet industrial needs for tin by providing for the maintenance of a domestic tin-smelting industry.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on June 26, 1947, present to the President, for his approval, bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 381. An act for the relief of Allen T. Feamster, Jr.;

H. R. 407. An act for the relief of Claude R. Hall and Florence V. Hall;

H. R. 493. An act to amend section 4 of the act entitled "An act to control the possession, sale, transfer, and use of pistols and other dangerous weapons in the District of Columbia," approved July 8, 1932 (sec. 22, 3204 D. C. Code, 1940 ed.);

H. R. 577. An act to preserve historic graveyards in abandoned military posts;

H. R. 617. An act for the relief of James Harry Martin;

H. R. 1067. An act for the relief of S. C. Spradling and R. T. Morris;

H. R. 1144. An act for the relief of Samuel W. Davis, Jr., Mrs. Samuel W. Davis, Jr., and Betty James Davis;

H. R. 1318. An act for the relief of Mrs. Fuku Kurokawa Thurn;

H. R. 1358. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the management and operation of naval plantations outside the continental United States," approved June 28, 1944;

H. R. 1362. An act to permit certain naval personnel to count all active service rendered under temporary appointment as warrant or commissioned officers in the United States Navy and the United States Naval Reserve, or in the United States Marine Corps and the United States Marine Corps Reserve, for purposes of promotion to commissioned warrant officer in the United States Navy or the United States Marine Corps, respectively;

H. R. 1371. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to appoint, for supply duty only, officers of the line of the Marine Corps, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1375. An act to further amend section 10 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, so as to provide for the clothing allowance of enlisted men of the Army, Marine Corps, and Marine Corps Reserve;

H. R. 1376. An act to amend the acts of October 14, 1942 (56 Stat. 786), as amended, and November 28, 1943 (57 Stat. 593), as amended, so as to authorize transportation of dependents and household effects of personnel of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard to overseas bases;

H. R. 1514. An act for the relief of certain disbursing officers of the Army of the United States, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1628. An act relinquishing to the State of Illinois certain right, title, or interest of the United States of America, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1807. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to grant to the county of Pittsburg, Okla., a perpetual easement for the construction, maintenance, and operation of a public highway over a portion of the United States naval ammunition depot, McAlester, Okla.;

H. R. 1845. An act to amend existing laws relating to military leave of certain employees of the United States or of the District of Columbia so as to equalize rights to leave of

State experiment stations, soil-conservation education and technical advice through the Extension Service, the Agricultural Conservation Program through State committees and limited to practices specified by the Extension Service, a "more representative" State committee, etc. (pp. 8927-9).

19. EMPLOYEES' LOYALTY. Rep. Eberharter, Pa., spoke against H. R. 3813, the Federal-employees' loyalty bill (pp. 8929-30).
20. APPROPRIATIONS. Received from the President an appropriation estimate of \$861,000 to carry on operations of the Remount Service for the fiscal year 1948 (H. Doc. 397), to Appropriations Committee (p. 8931).
21. VIRGIN ISLANDS. The Agriculture Committee reported without amendment S. 512, to extend the FHA, SCS, and ACP programs to the Virgin Islands (H. Rept. 878)(p. 8932).
22. RECLAMATION. The Public Lands Committee reported with amendments H. R. 2873, to amend the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 (H. Rept. 880)(p. 8932).
23. CIVIL-SERVICE RETIREMENT. The Post Office and Civil Service Committee reported without amendment H. R. 4127, to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act (H. Rept. 888)(p. 8932).
24. GRAZING. The Public Lands Committee reported without amendment H. R. 4079, to amend the Taylor Grazing Act (H. Rept. 890)(p. 8932).
25. ADJOURNED until Mon., July 14 (p. 8931). Legislative program for this week, as announced by Majority Leader Halleck: Mon., D. C. legislation; Tues., private calendar; some time during week: H. R. 3813, employees' loyalty; H. R. 4102, Science Foundation; S. J. Res. 123, repeal of certain war and emergency powers; etc. (pp. 8926-7).

SENATE - July 11 (continued)

26. LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM. The Daily Digest states: "Following disposition of income-tax reduction bill, H. R. 3950, the Senate will complete action on H. R. 3678, War Department appropriation, and then debate H. R. 3839, independent offices appropriation bill, and H. R. 3601, Agriculture Department appropriation bill. Saturday sessions are likely for the remainder of the session, and the program of legislation is indicated by the following statement by Senator Taft: 'After disposition of the tax-reduction bill and the remaining appropriation bills, the following bills now on the calendar will be proposed for consideration. These bills have been selected largely because it is hoped they can be disposed of without long debate. Several other important measures apparently involving more controversy are under consideration for action before adjournment on July 26. The calendar will be called from time to time for bills to which there is no objection: H. Con. Res. 51, Reorganization Plan No. 3... S. 1584, to establish a 5-year sugar program...' (pp. D524-5.)"

BILLS INTRODUCED - July 11

27. AGRICULTURAL INVESTIGATION. S. Res. 147, by Sen. Thye, Minn. (for himself and Sens. Aiken and Young), to direct the Agriculture and Forestry Committee to study "existing and pending agricultural legislation and...the trends, needs, and problems of agriculture" and to report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date. To Agriculture and Forestry Committee. (p. 8831.)

- by Sen. McCarthy, Wis.,
28. HOUSING INVESTIGATION. S. Con. Res. 25, to create a joint committee to investigate the housing situation. To Banking and Currency Committee. (p. 8831.)
 29. RECLAMATION. H. R. 4157, by Rep. Engle, Calif., to authorize the American River Basin development, Calif., for irrigation and reclamation. To Public Lands Committee. (p. 8932.)
 30. BANKING. H. R. 4166, by Rep. Lenke, N. Dak., to create the Bank of the United States, etc. To Banking and Currency Committee. (p. 8932.)
 31. LATIN AMERICA. H. R. 4168, by Rep. Jonkman, Mich., to provide for reincorporation of the Institute of Inter-American Affairs. To Foreign Affairs Committee. (p. 8933.)

ITEMS IN APPENDIX - July 11

32. FLOOD CONTROL. Rep. Reeves, Mo., inserted a Kansas City Star editorial favoring additional flood-control appropriations (pp. A3675-6).
33. RURAL ELECTRIFICATION. Extension of remarks of Rep. Poage, Tex., commending REA in connection with Rural Electrification Week (pp. A3690-1).
34. APPROPRIATIONS; FOREIGN RELIEF. Extension of remarks of Rep. Horan, Wash., saying the rise in food costs is largely attributable to "inflationary budgets" and shipments of food for foreign relief (p. A3701).

SENATE - July 12

35. TAXATION. Continued debate on H. R. 3950, the tax-reduction bill (pp. 8937-89).
36. RECESSED until Mon., July 14 (p. 8990).

HOUSE - July 12

37. FARM LABOR. The Agriculture Committee discussed in executive session H. R. 3367, to provide for a permanent farm-labor program through the Extension Service (p. D528).
38. RESEARCH. The Agriculture Committee (but did not actually report) H. R. 4110, to amend the Research and Marketing Act of 1946 so as to provide that not less than 20% of the funds "appropriated", rather than those "authorized to be appropriated", for general research shall be used by the State agricultural experiment stations for conducting marketing research projects approved by USDA (p. D528).
39. WOOL. The Agriculture Committee approved (but did not actually report) S. 1498, the wool price-support bill (p. D528).
40. PEANUT QUOTAS. The Agriculture Committee approved (but did not actually report) H. R. 4124, to amend the peanut-marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 (p. D528).
41. SURPLUS PROPERTY. The Expenditures in the Executive Departments Committee approved (but did not actually report) H. R. 119, which allows WAA to dispose of plants which cost the Government \$1 million (now \$5 million) or more without further authority from Congress; S. 1515, which makes surplus property

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

Senate continued debate on tax bill.

House was not in session.

Wool price support bill ordered reported to House.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages 8935-8937

Bills Introduced: Seven bills and two resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 1617-1623; S. Res. 148 and 149.

Pages 8936-8937

Bills Reported: Bills and resolutions were reported, as follows:

S. 339, private relief bill (S. Rept. 505);

S. 1576, to give subpoena power to Sec. of Treas. for conducting hearings relative to alcoholic permits (S. Rept. 506);

H. R. 1180, to authorize coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of 100th anniversary of admission of Wisconsin into the Union (S. Rept. 507);

H. R. 3864, to amend D. C. Unemployment Compensation Act relative to contribution rates after military service (S. Rept. 508);

H. R. 2225, authorizing transfer of land in Texas (placed on Calendar);

H. R. 1132, to amend Shipping Act on conveyance of vessels (S. Rept. 509);

H. R. 2109, to amend the CAA Act of 1938 relative to through rates (S. Rept. 510);

H. R. 3539, to authorize construction of a chapel at Coast Guard Academy (S. Rept. 511). *Pages 8936-8937*

Bills Referred: The following House-passed bills were referred to the committees indicated: H. R. 4051 (Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce); H. R. 4075 (Committee on Finance); and H. J. Res. 233

(Calendar). (For passage in House, see Digest, p. D522.)

Page 8937

Tax Bill: Senate continued debate on H. R. 3950, reduction of individual income-tax payments, effective January 1, 1948. The following eight amendments by Senator Morse were defeated: Declaration of policy providing that no tax reduction should be made so long as employment production remains at high levels, rejected 22 yeas to 60 nays; amendment providing taxation of future issues of Federal, State, and local obligations, beginning January 1, 1948, rejected 18 yeas to 62 nays; amendments on reduction of tax rate for lower income groups, carry-overs of net operating losses, tax on small corporations, capital gains and losses, estate and gift taxes, and one providing for the President to submit in his next economic report recommendations for integration of Federal, State, and local tax programs, were all rejected by voice vote. *Pages 8937-8989*

Nominations: The following nominations were received: Maj. Gen. William P. T. Hill, to be a major gen. while serving as Marine Corps Quartermaster General, together with 47 postmasters, and 82 in the Diplomatic and Foreign Service. The nomination of Willard L. Thorp, to serve as U. S. representative on the UN Economic and Social Council was received and the previous nomination of Francis Biddle, to the same post, withdrawn. *Page 8990*

Program for Monday: Recessed at 8:49 until noon, Monday, July 14, when debate will be resumed on H. R. 3950, income-tax reduction.

Reports on Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

WAR DEPARTMENT, CIVIL

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee continued hearings on H. R. 4002, War Department civil functions appropriation bill, with additional testimony on flood-control projects.

UN SITE

Committee on Foreign Relations: In executive session, approved S. J. Res. 144, to authorize President to approve UN site agreement.

INTERSTATE BILLS

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce: In executive session, the following bills were approved: S. 1132, to amend Shipping Act relative to officer of corporation authorized to execute sale or conveyance of a vessel, with amendments; H. R. 3598, granting congressional consent for fisheries compact on Pacific coast and creating Pacific-Marine Fisheries Commission, with amendments; H. R. 3539, to authorize construction of

a chapel at Coast Guard Academy; H. R. 2109, amends Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 relative to through rates; H. R. 2331, to amend ICC Act to include sleeping-car companies in definition of "carriers," relating to issuance of securities; H. R. 3247, provide basic authority for use of Coast and Geodetic Survey appropriations; H. R. 3672, to create academic advisory board for Merchant Marine Academy; H. R. 3494, to establish permanent commissioned personnel strength of Coast Guard; and S. 885, to provide that certain U. S. dredging equipment be documented under the U. S. laws.

SOLICITOR GENERAL

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee heard the following witnesses testify in support of the nomination of Philip B. Perlman, to be U. S. Solicitor General: Mr. Perlman; Wendell Allen, Baltimore attorney; and P. A. Ahlstrom, Sec.-Treas. of Voting Machine Corp.

ARMY-NAVY DISBURSING OFFICERS

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee concluded hearings on S. 323, to provide relief for Army-Navy disbursing officers, after receiving supporting testimony from Gen. E. M. Foster, and civilian personnel.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

The House was not in session today. Its next meeting will be held on Monday, July 14, at 12 o'clock noon.

Reports on Committee Meetings

FARM LABOR

Committee on Agriculture: Full committee met in executive session on H. R. 3367, farm-labor program, and various other bills and voted to favorably report to the House the following bills:

H. R. 4124, amends the peanut-marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938.

H. R. 4110, amends the Marketing Research Act (Bankhead-Jones Act).

S. 1498, continues support prices for wool.

NATIONAL SECURITY ACT OF 1947

Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments: Subcommittee to mark up H. R. 2319, National Security Act of 1947, met in executive session and concluded their work on the new bill which will probably be presented to the full committee on Monday or Tuesday.

Subcommittee on Surplus Property met in executive session and ordered favorably reported to the full committee the following bills:

H. Con. Res. 57, that no final action be taken by WAA leading to disposition of property in Palm Springs, Calif., until the subcommittee of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments has reviewed the case and made a report thereon.

S. 364, Surplus Airport Act—authorizes WAA to dispose of surplus landing and nonlanding facilities.

H. R. 119, allows Surplus Property Board to dispose of plants which cost the Government \$1 million (now \$5 million) or more without further authority from Congress (amending 58 Stat. 19).

S. 1515, makes surplus property available for the alleviation of damage caused by flood or other catastrophe.

H. R. 3800, amends the Surplus Property Act of 1944 to provide that veterans' organizations shall be given a priority in the purchase of surplus property.

GILA RECLAMATION PROJECT

Committee on Public Lands: Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation met in executive session and voted to favorably report to the full committee S. 483, which reauthorizes the Gila Federal reclamation project and reduces its area.

DIGEST OF
CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS
OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE

Division of Legislative Reports

(For Department Staff only)

Issued

July 16, 1947

For actions of

July 15, 1947

80th-1st, No. 135

CONTENTS

Agricultural appropriation bill..... 1	Lands.....19	Prices, support..... 5
Appropriations..1,2,13,14,17,18	Lands, farm.....31	Quarantine, plant..... 6
Dairy industry.....32	Lands, reclamation.....11	R.F.C.....22,25
Farm program.....24a	Legislative program.....21	Regional authority.....34
Flood control.....28	Loans, farm.....29,36	Research.....9,15
Food, inspection.....26	Marketing.....16,38	Small business.....10,35
Foreign affairs.....16	Monopolies.....35	Sugar.....21
Forests and forestry....3,8	Peanuts..... 7	Water utilization.....33
Housing.....21,23,37	Personnel.....4,10,12,20	Veterans' benefits.20,25,29,36
	Prices.....27	Wool.....5,30
	Cooperatives.....4a	

HIGHLIGHTS: House sent agricultural appropriation bill to conference. House passed bill to permit agencies to meet payrolls for first half of July. House passed bill to permit sale of timber in Tongass Forest. House passed employees' loyalty bill. House committees reported wool bill without import-control provision, bill to limit entry of nursery stock, bill to amend various peanut-quota provisions, bill to abolish Jackson Hole Monument and return lands to Forest Service, and bill to change basis for 20% marketing-research requirement. Both Houses agreed to conference report on legislative appropriation bill. Rep. Hope introduced bill to authorize Agriculture Committee to investigate agricultural matters. Senate passed independent offices appropriation bill. Sen. Williams said CCC was responsible for "technical corner" on wheat market and discussed Government marketing operations.

HOUSE

1. AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL. Reps. Dirksen, Plumley, Andersen, Horan, Phillips of Calif., Cannon, Whitten, and Shoppard were appointed conferees on this bill, H. R. 3601 (p. 9103). Senate conferees were appointed July 14.
2. TEMPORARY APPROPRIATIONS. Passed without amendment H. J. Res. 240, which reads as follows: "Resolved, etc., That there are hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such amounts as may be necessary to meet pay rolls (obligations for which were incurred in accordance with section 102 of the Second Urgent Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1947, Public Law 161) for pay periods ending prior to July 16, 1947: Provided, That expenditures hereunder shall be charged to the appropriate appropriations for the fiscal year 1948 when made" (p. 9117).
3. FORESTS. Passed as reported H. J. Res. 205, to authorize sale of timber in the Tongass National Forest, Alaska, in such a way as to facilitate pulp production in view of the aboriginal claims of Indians (p. 9094). A similar measure, S. J. Res. 118, has been reported in the Senate.
4. EMPLOYEES' LOYALTY. Passed, 319-61, with amendments H. R. 3813, which provides for a preliminary loyalty check on all Federal employees and job applicants by the Civil Service Commission and an investigation by FBI of adverse findings, prior to action by a 5-member Federal Loyalty Review Board, whose findings of fact are to be final (pp. 9118-56). A motion to recommit the bill to provide for appeal to the Court of Appeals was rejected 133-248.

- 4a. TVA COOPERATIVES. Received from this Department a proposed bill to provide for liquidation of Tenn. Valley Coop. Inc., by USDA; to Agriculture Committee (p. 9163).
5. WOOL-PRICE SUPPORTS. The Agriculture Committee reported without amendment S. 1498, the wool bill which is the same as the vetoed bill except for elimination of the import-control provisions (H. Rept. 920)(p. 9163).
6. PLANT QUARANTINE. The Agriculture Committee reported with amendments S. 338, to authorize USDA to limit importation of nursery stock to that needed for propagation and require that such stock be grown in post-entry quarantine to determine whether it is infested or infected (H. Rept. 921)(p. 9163).
7. PEANUT QUOTAS. The Agriculture Committee reported without amendment H. R. 4124, to amend peanut-quota provisions by providing that the farm marketing quota shall be the actual production of the farm acreage allotment and that no peanuts shall be marketed under the quota for any farm other than peanuts actually produced on the farm; by changing the excess-marketing penalty to 50% of the basic loan rate; and by making peanuts subject to quotas even though marketed before the beginning of the marketing year, with penalties for false statements regarding this (H. Rept. 922)(pp. 9163-4).
8. FORESTS. The Public Lands Committee reported with amendments H. R. 1330, to abolish the Jackson Hole National Monument and return certain forest lands to the Forest Service (H. Rept. 914)(p. 9163).
9. RESEARCH. The Agriculture Committee reported without amendment H. R. 4110, which amends the Research and Marketing Act of 1946 by providing that not less than 20% of the funds "appropriated", rather than those "authorized to be appropriated", for general research shall be used by the State agricultural experiment stations for conducting marketing research approved by the Department (H. Rept. 930)(p. 9164).
10. PERSONNEL. The Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee reported without amendment S. Con. Res. 14, favoring fair representation of small businessmen on policy-making bodies created by Executive appointments (H. Rept. 929)(p. 9164).
11. RECLAMATION. The Public Lands Committee reported without amendment H. Res. 244, for investigations looking to provision of additional water for southern Calif. and the Colo. River Basin (H. Rept. 916)(p. 9163).
This Committee reported without amendment H. R. 3834, to authorize a project for rehabilitation of certain works of the Fort Sumner irrigation district in N. Mex. (H. Rept. 924)(p. 9164).
12. CIVIL-SERVICE RETIREMENT. The Rules Committee reported a resolution providing for consideration of H. R. 4127, the omnibus retirement bill (p. 9163).
13. LEGISLATIVE APPROPRIATION BILL. Both Houses agreed to the conference report on this bill, H. R. 3993 (pp. 9069-70, 9109-10). This bill will now be sent to the President.
14. NAVAL APPROPRIATION BILL. Both Houses agreed to the conference report on this bill, H. R. 3493 (pp. 9070-1, 9104-9). This bill will now be sent to the President.
15. RESEARCH. H. R. 4102, as reported (see Digest 131), creates a National Science Foundation of 24 members to be appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate, to formulate, develop, and establish a national policy for promotion of fundamental research and education in the sciences and to correlate its scientific programs with those undertaken by individuals and by public and private research groups; provides for an executive committee of the Foundation and a Director to be appointed by the Foundation; establishes an interdepartmental

committee, including a representative of this Department, to aid in coordinating research programs of Government agencies; provides that the activities of the Foundation shall supplement, and not supersede, curtail, or limit the functions or activities of other Government agencies; and authorizes Government agencies to make transfers from their research funds to the Foundation for such use as is consistent with the purposes for which the funds were provided.

SENATE

16. **MARKETING.** Sen. Williams, Del., said CCC was responsible for the "technical corner" on the wheat market and discussed marketing operations of CCC and other Government agencies and shipments made for foreign relief (pp. 9086-91).
17. **INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1948.** Passed with amendments this bill, H.R. 3839 (pp. 9072-85). Sens. Reed, Bridges, Brooks, Cordon, Green, Russell, and McKellar were appointed conferees (p. 9085). House conferees not yet appointed. None of the non-committee amendments affect this Department.
18. **WAR MILITARY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1948.** Passed as reported this bill, H.R. 3678 (pp. 9064-9). Sens. Gurney, Brooks, Reed, Bridges, Thomas (Okla.), Hayden, and Overton were appointed conferees (p. 9069). House conferees not yet appointed.
19. **LANDS.** The Public Lands Committee reported with amendment S. 1368, to increase the size of isolated or disconnected tracts or parcels of the public domain which may be sold (S.Rept. 547) (p. 9047).
20. **PERSONNEL.** The Public Lands Committee reported without amendment H.R. 187, to include transportation by air for U.S. employees stationed in Alaska (S.Rept. 550) (p. 9047).
The Civil Service Committee approved (but did not actually report) H.R. 966, to amend Sec. 14 of the Veterans' Preference Act so as to make it mandatory for an administrative officer to take corrective action recommended by CSC in the case of appeals made by preference eligibles because of discharge, suspension, demotion, etc. (p. D536).
The Civil Service Committee approved (but did not actually report) H.R. 1995, to permit Federal employees to withdraw retirement deductions at any time within ten years (p. D536).
21. **LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM.** Sen. Taft, Ohio, requested that orderly procedure be maintained on the list of bills he inserted and which included S. 1584, to establish a 5-year sugar program; and H.Con.Res. 51, to disapprove Reorganization Plan No. 3 (housing) (p. 9086).
22. **R.F.C. REPORT.** Received the RFC report for February 1947 (p. 9046).
23. **HOUSING.** Sen. McMahon, Conn., inserted a letter from Norwalk, Conn., favoring the Taft-Elliender-Wagner housing bill (p. 9046).
24. **COMMITTEE STAFFS.** Various committees, including Banking and Currency, Civil Service, Small Business, Public Lands, and Expenditures in the Executive Departments, submitted reports listing the names of staff members and their salaries (pp. 9047-50).

BILLS INTRODUCED

- 24a. **FARM PROGRAM.** H.Res. 298, by Rep. Hope, Kans., authorizing the Committee on Agriculture to make studies and investigations into matters relating to agriculture. To Rules Committee. (p. 9164)

25. R.F.C.; VETERANS' BENEFITS. H.R. 4202, by Rep. Rogers (Fla.), and H.R. 4204, by Rep. Heckworth (Tex.), to amend the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act so as to authorize the RFC to purchase loans guaranteed or insured under the GI Bill. To Banking and Currency Committee. (p. 9164.)
26. FOODS. H.R. 4211, by Rep. Bolton, Ohio, to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act so as to prohibit the introduction into interstate commerce of salt, in certain containers, not having a required content of iodides. To Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. (p. 9164.)
27. PRICES. H.Con. Res. 73, by Rep. Lodge, (Conn.), and H.Con. Res. 74, by Rep. Foote (Conn.), establishing a joint committee to investigate high prices of consumer goods. To Rules Committee. (p. 9164.)
28. FLOOD CONTROL. S. 1639, by Sen. Hatch, N.Mex., authorizing the repair and rehabilitation of irrigation works damaged by flood in the prevention of flood damage in the Fort Sumner irrigation district. To Public Lands Committee. (p. 9050.)
29. FARM LOANS; VETERANS. H.R. 4147 (see Digest 131) would extend the loan-guarantee provisions of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 to veterans of World War I.

ITEMS IN APPENDIX

30. WOOL. Rep. Mansfield, Mont., inserted an article by Carl O. Henson (secretary, Mont. Wool Growers' Assn.), "Do We Want a Wool-Growing Industry in This Country," which sets forth facts concerning the sheep industry. (pp. A3747-8).
31. FARM LANDS. Rep. Miller, Calif., inserted a VFW resolution favoring the family-type farm and opposing S. 912, to repeal the acreage limitations on the Central Valley project (p. A3725).
32. DAIRY INDUSTRY. Rep. Davis, Wis., inserted his recent speech before the Southern Wisconsin Cheese Assn., in which he discussed the future of the cheese industry (pp. A3745-7).
33. WATER UTILIZATION. Rep. Poulson, Calif., inserted a Los Angeles Times article urging that the question of rights to water of the Colorado River be settled now to end the years-old controversy (p. A3741).
34. MISSOURI VALLEY AUTHORITY. Rep. Price, Ill., inserted a N.Y. Times editorial, "Mr. Truman Backs the MVA" (p. A3723).
35. MONOPOLIES; SMALL BUSINESS. Sen. Sparkman, Ala., inserted a statement by C.W. Harder (pres. National Federation of Small Business) urging "vigorous and immediate antitrust-law enforcement" (pp. A3728-30).
36. LOANS; VETERANS' BENEFITS. Rep. MacKinnon, Minn., inserted a United States News article, "Future of Veterans' Loans — Increased Risk for Private Lenders, With RFC Backing Eliminated" (p. A3738).
37. HOUSING. Rep. Donohue, Mass., inserted a Worcester Housing Authority endorsement of his bill, H.R. 3565, to provide housing for veterans (pp. A3743-4).
Rep. Lane, Mass., inserted a Boston Traveler editorial favoring the Taft-Elliender-Wagner housing bill (p. A3750).

CONTINUING SUPPORT FOR WOOL

JULY 15, 1947.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

Mr. HOPE, from the Committee on Agriculture, submitted the following

R E P O R T

• [To accompany S. 1498]

The Committee on Agriculture, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1498) to provide support for wool, and for other purposes, having considered the same, report thereon with a recommendation that it do pass without amendment.

STATEMENT

This bill (S. 1498) is essentially the same as the bill (H. J. Res. 158) which was reported favorably by this committee on March 26, 1947. The purpose of that bill was to direct the Commodity Credit Corporation to continue the wool price support program then in effect and to authorize it to dispose of stocks of domestic wool at less than the support price, if necessary.

Some such legislation was made necessary by the announced intention of the Department of Agriculture to terminate its wool-support program on April 15, 1947. With most other major agricultural commodities guaranteed price support until the end of 1948, the legislation was required, according to the Secretary of Agriculture, in order to "put wool on an equal footing with the basic commodities and the so-called Steagall commodities."

The legislation reported at that time (H. J. Res. 158) was approved by the Department of Agriculture and was on substantially the terms recommended by the Department. Before that bill was called up in the House another measure (S. 814) had passed the Senate and this bill was subsequently reported favorably by this committee in lieu of the House bill (H. J. Res. 158). After some amendment the Senate bill (S. 814) was adopted and was vetoed by the President.

Since the bill now before the committee (S. 1498) is substantially identical with the bill originally reported by this committee (H. J. Res. 158), letters from the Secretary of Agriculture written at the

time that legislation was under consideration are included as a part of this report.

IMPACT OF WAR ON WOOL

The wool price-support program which is proposed to be extended by this bill has been in effect since 1943. It was originally instituted as a war measure. Wool is a strategic and critical war material, and was designated as such in the President's list of critical war materials. During the war, it was considered vitally necessary to maintain domestic wool production in order to assure an adequate supply for essential war and civilian needs. In 1943, the Department of Agriculture, through the Commodity Credit Corporation, instituted its wool-purchase program for the purpose of maintaining domestic production and establishing a stock pile of wool for war purposes. Under that program the Commodity Credit Corporation became the exclusive buyer of domestic wool at a fixed schedule of prices. As early as 1940, other agencies of the Government were seeking to establish strategic reserve supplies of wool, and during 1941 and 1942 the United States purchased and stock-piled over 300,000,000 pounds of Australian wool to protect against a threatened short supply. In addition, a cooperative arrangement was worked out with the United Kingdom, whereby large quantities of British wool were stock-piled in this country. Other wartime measures of major importance affecting wool were also instituted. Ceiling-price regulations were established, freezing the price of raw wool at the December 9, 1941, level. Restrictions were imposed in 1942 upon the manufacture of woolen goods for civilian use, and these restrictions became more drastic as the war progressed. All of the foregoing war measures have contributed to the difficult position in which the wool producers find themselves today.

PRESENT WOOL SITUATION

Mill consumption of wool in the United States is at the highest level in peacetime history, but according to the Department of Agriculture, if a support program is not continued, prices of wool to growers for the 1947 clip will decline to a level competitive with prices of imported wool and will be somewhat lower than the prices received under the support program during the last 4 years. Market prices for representative grades of imported wool, duty-paid at Boston, in February were 8 to 12 percent lower than the Commodity Credit Corporation's purchase prices for comparable domestic wools. This is in part due to the existence of large stocks of wool both in the United States and abroad.

Total United States stocks of domestic and foreign wool held by mills, dealers, and by the Commodity Credit Corporation as of December 28, 1946, were 895,000,000 pounds (grease basis). These stocks are more than three times as large as the 1935-39 average of 275,000,000 pounds for the corresponding date. Foreign stocks of wool are even larger. The joint wool selling corporation known as the "J. O." (Joint Organization), a British organization formed to handle Empire wools and which operates as the sole buyer and seller of such wools, has a present stock pile of approximately 2,000,000,000 pounds.

Foreign wools are being imported at an increasing rate, and are threatening to capture the entire domestic market. Importations of foreign raw-apparel wools into this country in 1946 were the greatest in peacetime history, and total 819,253,000 pounds. This represents about 90 percent of United States domestic consumption of wool and is approximately six times greater than the average annual importations during the period from 1936 to 1940, inclusive. This great increase in importation of foreign raw-apparel wools is due to the fact that the price of foreign wools, including a duty of 34 cents a pound, clean basis, was below the price of domestic wool, and that mill consumption in the United States in 1946 was the highest in any peacetime year.

The cost of producing wool in the principal wool-producing areas in the United States, as estimated by the United States Tariff Commission, are considerably in excess of the current market prices and are also in excess of the support price. Producer witnesses appearing before the committee pointed out that the number of stock sheep are at record low levels. From a high of 49,346,000 head on January 1, 1942, stock sheep numbers declined 34 percent within 5 years to 32,542,000 on January 1, 1947, the lowest on record since 1867. This sharp reduction in sheep numbers is the result of a number of factors, including increased farm operating costs, the uncertain outlook for wool prices, high lamb prices, and more attractive prices in enterprises competitive to sheep. Price uncertainty is due largely to the surplus stocks of wool which are in existence both here and abroad, and also to the possibility of a reduction in tariff since wool is among the list of commodities which are subject to possible tariff reduction.

SUPPORT LEVEL

The level at which domestic wool has been supported is essentially the ceiling price which was established under the Emergency Price Control Act. During the time the price-support program has been in effect, domestic producers have received on a national average basis, between 41.6 and 42.4 cents per pound in the grease. The parity price for wool as of February 15, 1947, was 40.4 cents per pound. Producer witnesses, who testified at the hearings, contended that wool should be supported on the basis of 90 percent of a comparable price, which as of February 15, 1947, would amount to 45.3 cents per pound. It is their contention that the base period (1909-14) used for the establishment of the parity formula is unfair with respect to wool, since the wool industry was in a depressed condition during that period. They also relied upon estimates of the cost of wool production prepared by the United States Tariff Commission to show that the cost of wool production was in excess of the support price. Although there is no doubt as to the need for a continuation of a wool-support program, it is the view of the committee that the support price should not be increased above the present support level. The parity formula is not an exact yardstick, and parity prices of some commodities established under that formula may not be said to be in normal relationship to other commodities, but the committee does not believe that it would be advisable to attempt to establish a higher level of support for the remainder of the support period. So far, comparable prices, for purposes of price support, have been established for only three commodities, all of which have come into general

use since the base period of 1909-14. Moreover, the support price established for wool under the price-support program was based upon the maximum ceiling price calculated under the provisions of the Emergency Price Control Act, and it is higher than the parity price. The committee has decided to recommend the continuance of the support program for wool at the present level, and to leave the question of the establishment of a comparable price for wool and for lambs for further study in connection with the whole problem of parity revision and the establishment of a long-time farm program. The Department of Agriculture has also recommended that the support level should not be changed.

REMOVAL OF RESTRICTIONS ON THE SALE OF WOOL

Under the existing provisions of law, the Commodity Credit Corporation is not permitted to sell wool below the parity price. Parity has been increasing constantly, and as of February 15, 1947, the parity price for wool in the grease rose to 40.4 cents per pound. This necessitated an increase in the selling price of wool owned by the Commodity Credit Corporation, and since the price of comparable grades and qualities of foreign wool, plus the duty, was already below the price of domestic wool, the Commodity Credit Corporation is in a position of being unable to compete with foreign sellers or to sell its wool in competition with imported wools. Unless the restriction which prevents the Commodity Credit Corporation from selling its wool below the parity price is removed, an increasingly larger portion of the domestic market will be captured by foreign wool while domestic stocks of wool in the hands of the Commodity Credit Corporation continue to increase. At this time, the Commodity Credit Corporation has on hand approximately 460,000,000 pounds of wool. The inability to sell its stocks of domestic wool not only results in the surrender of the domestic market to foreign wool, but it also results in increased storage costs. Such costs on the basis of present stocks amount to approximately \$4,000,000 a year. To alleviate this situation the bill authorizes the Commodity Credit Corporation to dispose of its wool without regard to any restriction imposed under existing law. It is intended by this provision to enable the Commodity Credit Corporation to merchandise its wool stocks in an orderly manner and according to good business practice. It is not intended that it should dump its stocks of wool, or that it should wage a price-cutting war or depress the market unduly. It is intended, however, to put the Commodity Credit Corporation in a position to compete for the domestic market, and to deprive foreign sellers of the competitive advantage they have had of pricing their wool just below the point at which the Commodity Credit Corporation is permitted to sell its wool.

METHOD OF SUPPORT

Since the inception of the wool-support program in 1943, the method employed by the Commodity Credit Corporation to support wool has been to purchase the domestic wool at the support price, and to resell such wool at the market price. This bill authorizes a continuation of that method.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE RECOMMENDS CONTINUED SUPPORT
FOR WOOL

The recommendations of the Department of Agriculture with respect to the need for continued support for wool are embodied in its reports submitted on H. R. 63 and H. R. 1890. The reports are as follows:

MARCH 11, 1947.

HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE,

Chairman, Committee on Agriculture, House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. HOPE: This is in reply to your request of February 17 for a report on H. R. 63, a bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to establish a comparable price for wool, a comparable price for lambs, and to provide support price for wool and for other purposes.

The provisions of H. R. 63 are similar in many respects to the provisions of H. R. 6043, introduced during the last session of the Seventy-ninth Congress and approved, with certain changes, by your committee. A similar bill, S. 2033, was also approved by the Senate Committee on Agriculture in the Seventy-ninth Congress. While the main provisions of H. R. 6043 and S. 2033 were endorsed by this Department in 1946, a number of developments have taken place since the close of the Seventy-ninth Congress which have caused us to make certain changes in our recommendations. Some of these changes, it appears, were also felt desirable by your committee and have already been reflected in the bill which was reported out by your committee during the last session of the Seventy-ninth Congress, and in H. R. 63, introduced this session.

We are in accord with the provision in section 2 that the period of price support for the present be confined to the 2 years 1947 and 1948. This would put wool on an equal footing with the basic commodities and the so-called Steagall commodities. As a result of the President's proclamation of December 31, 1946, declaring the termination of hostilities, the Department's obligation to support the price of the basic commodities at 90 percent of parity in the case of corn, wheat, tobacco, peanuts for nuts, and rice, and at 92½ percent of parity in the case of cotton, will end with the 1948 crops of such commodities. The Department's obligation to support the so-called Steagall commodities, namely, hogs, eggs, chickens (with certain exceptions), and turkeys, milk and butterfat, dried peas of certain varieties, dried edible beans of certain varieties, soybeans for oil, peanuts for oil, flaxseed for oil, American-Egyptian cotton, potatoes, and sweet-potatoes, at 90 percent of the parity or comparable price will end on December 31, 1948. The consideration of our long-time price support policy for wool may be reserved until such time as our long-time price support policy for all agricultural commodities has been worked out.

As for the level at which the price of wool should be supported during 1947 and 1948, we feel that in the light of recent increases in parity, consideration should be given to establishing the level no higher than the prices paid by the Commodity Credit Corporation for wool in 1946. In 1946 the Commodity Credit Corporation paid on the average between 41 and 42 cents a pound for wool in the grease. On the basis of January 1947 figures, the support price for wool, as proposed in the present bill, would be 44.1 cents a pound for 1947. In order to sell domestic wools in the past year in competition with imported wools, the Commodity Credit Corporation has incurred a considerable loss. To establish the support level as proposed in the present bill would undoubtedly result in even greater losses for 1947. If the present parity level continues through January 1948, losses during 1948 probably would also be greater than in 1946. We recommend, therefore, that the support-price level for the 2-year period be "not less than the price at which the Commodity Credit Corporation supported wool in 1946." The establishment of a comparable price for wool and for lambs could await study of the whole problem of revising the parity formula which I discussed with your committee on January 22, 1947.

In H. R. 6043, as originally introduced in the Seventy-ninth Congress, there were provisions authorizing the establishment of official wool and mohair standards. These provisions were deleted from the bill reported out by your committee during the Seventy-ninth Congress and have been deleted from the present bill, H. R. 63. We feel that it would be desirable to restore these provisions in the bill.

To effect the changes recommended herein, it is suggested that the bill be amended as follows:

(1) That section 2 (a) be amended to read:

"Commodity Credit Corporation is directed, through loans, purchases, or other operations, during the period beginning with the effective date of this act and ending December 31, 1948, to support a price to producers of wool in the continental United States and Territories of not less than the price at which the Commodity Credit Corporation supported wool in 1946."

(2) That section 3 of the present bill be deleted, and the deletion be reflected in the title of the bill.

(3) That sections 4 and 5 be renumbered sections 3 and 4 and a new section 5 be added to read as follows:

"SEC. 5 (a). The Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized, after investigation and due notice and opportunity for a hearing, to fix and establish types and standards of quality and condition for the grading of wool, mohair, wool tops, and mohair tops, and to conduct tests for the shrinkage, clean content, length and fineness of fiber, and mohair tops. The standards fixed and established by the Secretary, as provided herein, shall be published in the Federal Register and 60 days after such publication shall become and be the Official Wool and Mohair Standards of the United States, and such official standards shall be substituted for and be used in lieu of any official wool or mohair standards heretofore established by the Secretary of Agriculture under the provisions of any existing law. The Secretary of Agriculture shall have the power to alter or modify, after investigation and due notice and opportunity for a hearing, such official standards whenever the necessities of the trade may require and such alterations or modifications shall likewise become effective 60 days after publication thereof in the Federal Register.

"(b) Any person who has custody of or a financial interest in any wool, mohair, or tops therefrom, may submit the same or samples thereof, drawn in accordance with the rules and regulations of the Secretary of Agriculture, to such officer or officers of the Department of Agriculture as may be designated for the purpose pursuant to the rules and regulations of the Secretary of Agriculture, for a determination of the true grade, shrinkage, or clean content, including the comparison thereof, if requested, with types or with other samples submitted for the purpose. The final certificate of the Department of Agriculture showing such determination shall be binding on officers of the United States and shall be accepted in the courts of the United States as prima facie evidence of the true type, grade, or comparison thereof when involved in any transaction or shipment in commerce. The Secretary of Agriculture shall make rules and regulations for submitting samples of wool, mohair, or tops therefrom, for typing or grading.

"(c) The Secretary of Agriculture may cause to be collected such charges as he may find to be reasonable for determinations made under subsection (b) of this section.

"(d) Whenever the Official Wool and Mohair Standards of the United States established under this section shall be represented by practical forms, the Department of Agriculture shall furnish copies thereof, upon request, to any person, and the cost thereof, as determined by the Secretary of Agriculture, shall be paid by the person making the request.

"(e) The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to effectuate agreements with wool associations, wool exchanges, and other wool or mohair organizations, either domestic, foreign, or international, for (1) adoption, use, and observation of universal standards of wool and mohair grades, (2) the arbitration or settlement of disputes with respect thereto, and (3) the preparation, distribution, inspection, and protection of the practical forms or copies thereof under such agreements.

"(f) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated annually, commencing with the fiscal year 1948, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated such amount as may be necessary to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to carry out the provisions of this section 6."

The provisions of section 5 of H. R. 63, which would permit the Commodity Credit Corporation to sell its stocks of wool at less than parity, are essential. The Commodity Credit Corporation owns about 460 million pounds of wool out of more than 1¼ billion pounds purchased since 1943. In view of the prohibition against selling under parity, we have had to increase the selling price sharply as parity has increased in recent months. In spite of our large stocks, mills are buying large quantities of imported wools because they can be obtained at a lower price. At present, in view of the restriction against selling at less than parity, we are seriously handicapped in competing with foreign government corporations for our own domestic market, and we cannot liquidate the holdings that hang over the wool market before the new crop comes along. Your attention is called to the

fact that our wool-purchase program expires on April 15, 1947. The program was undertaken as a war emergency measure and we do not plan to continue it unless the Congress specially directs us to do so. Accordingly, you may wish to consider the proposed legislation at an early date.

In view of the telephone request that this report be submitted today, we have not had an opportunity to obtain from the Bureau of the Budget advice as to the relationship of this proposed legislation, or report thereon, to the program of the President.

Sincerely yours,

CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
Secretary.

MARCH 11, 1947.

HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE.

Chairman, Committee on Agriculture, House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. HOPE: This is in reply to your request of February 17 for a report on H. R. 1890, a bill to amend section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act (reenacted by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937), so as to extend such act to all programs of the Department of Agriculture, and agencies operating under its direction, and for other purposes.

The bill would provide for the imposition of import quotas on wool (except carpet wools) and on processed wool products, whenever it appears that foreign wool is being imported or threatens to be imported into the United States in quantities and under conditions which would materially interfere with any domestic wool program undertaken by the Department of Agriculture or any of its agencies. Import quotas would be established quarterly in amounts which would maintain the price of domestic wool in the United States. To the extent that prices of domestic wool are not maintained at the specified levels, payments to producers would be authorized. The bill would also require the establishment of a comparable price for wool and provide for price support to producers for the period ending December 31, 1948, at 90 percent of such comparable price. Complete responsibility for the wool-control program would be vested in the Secretary of Agriculture.

As you know, this Department favors the maintenance of a support price for wool at a level which is fair in relation to the support for other farm commodities. Our views in this respect are set out in full in a report previously made to you on H. R. 63.

This Department is also on record as favoring the use of quotas to prevent undue interference with domestic price-support programs. Legislation which would accomplish this was recently recommended to Congress and has now been introduced as H. R. 1825.

Although the use of import quotas appears to be necessary to protect domestic programs, there must be certain safeguards if the United States is to comply fully with the foreign economic policy expressed in the Trade Agreements Act. Appropriate safeguards would be provided if the present law were amended as proposed in H. R. 1825. Therefore, this Department does not favor the enactment of H. R. 1890 in its present form.

In view of the telephone request that this report be submitted today, we have not had an opportunity to obtain from the Bureau of the Budget advice as to the relationship of this proposed legislation, or report thereon, to the program of the President.

Sincerely yours,

CLINTON P. ANDERSON, *Secretary.*

DESCRIPTION OF THE JOINT RESOLUTION

Section 1 directs the Commodity Credit Corporation to continue until December 31, 1948, to support wool produced in the continental United States and Territories at the price and on the same terms and conditions at which the Commodity Credit Corporation supported wool in 1946. It is intended under this provision to give the Commodity Credit Corporation the same authority that it has had in the past to adjust support prices for individual grades and qualities of

wool in order to bring about a fair and equitable relationship in the support prices for the various grades and qualities of wool.

Section 2 authorizes the Secretary to utilize the facilities of county and local committees, and other authorized agencies, in carrying out the support program.

Section 3 provides that the Commodity Credit Corporation may dispose of wool owned by it without regard to any restriction imposed upon it by law. This authority is necessary to enable the Commodity Credit Corporation to market its stocks of wool.



80TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

S. 1498

[Report No. 920]

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

JUNE 27, 1947

Referred to the Committee on Agriculture

JULY 15, 1947

Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union
and ordered to be printed

AN ACT

To provide support for wool, and for other purposes.

- 1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That (a) The Commodity Credit Corporation shall continue,
4 until December 31, 1948, to support a price to producers of
5 wool in the continental United States and Territories at the
6 price it supported wool in 1946.
- 7 (b) Notwithstanding any other provisions hereof, the
8 Commodity Credit Corporation may adjust support prices
9 for individual grades and qualities of wool for the purpose of
10 bringing about a fair and equitable relationship in the support
11 prices for the various grades and qualities of wool; and may

1 make discounts from support prices for off-quality, inferior-
2 grade, or poorly prepared wool.

3 SEC. 2. The provisions of sections 385, 386, and 388 of
4 the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, shall
5 be applicable to the support operations carried out pursuant
6 to the first section of this Act.

7 SEC. 3. The Commodity Credit Corporation may, until
8 December 31, 1948, dispose of wool owned by it without
9 regard to any restriction imposed upon it by law.

Passed the Senate June 26 (legislative day, April 21),
1947.

Attest:

CARL A. LOEFFLER,

Secretary.

80TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

S. 1498

[Report No. 920]

AN ACT

To provide support for wool, and for other
purposes.

JUNE 27, 1947

Referred to the Committee on Agriculture

JULY 15, 1947

Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on
the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

passed the House on May 12. This bill provides for veterans who are receiving institutional or farm training.

The Mathews bill, H. R. 4007, was reported from committee on July 2, 1947, under Report No. 780. This bill supercedes H. R. 3583, which is for a similar purpose. It provides for automobiles for service-connected disabled veterans who sustained the loss, or loss of use of a foot or a hand, or who are blind. The Rules Committee was requested to permit a special rule but has taken no action upon a hearing held upon this request.

The Patterson bill, H. R. 3889, was reported from committee on July 8, 1947, under Report No. 808, and is now upon the Consent Calendar. This measure would establish a presumption of service-connection for chronic and tropical diseases. It would fill a need caused by extensive service by veterans of World War II in tropical countries.

The Mathews bill, H. R. 4055 was reported from committee on July 11, 1947, and is now upon the Consent Calendar of the House. This bill would grant to veterans of the Indian wars and to their dependents the same increase in pension (20 percent) that was given to Civil War and Spanish-American War veterans by H. R. 3961, which was passed by the House unanimously.

The Crow bill, H. R. 3623, was reported from committee on July 2, 1947, and is now upon the Consent Calendar of the House. It provides that members of the Communist Party shall be ineligible for veterans' benefits and exacts penalties for infraction of the law.

The following letter shows the need for H. R. 4007:

BOSTON, MASS., July 8, 1947.

DEAR MRS. ROGERS: I am a blinded amputee veteran of this past World War and although entitled to a car under the present bill, being an amputee, I am not able to qualify for one, being blinded in the same action in which I lost my left leg, blinded in addition to the loss of my leg, I cannot get a car as I cannot see to drive it myself, and I would like to add my case to the many you have already heard about who are left out of the present bill which just ended last month.

I think I am entitled to a car as an amputee but also more so being blinded, through no fault of my own and in action in Italy in the Infantry.

I have been following the accounts of your committee in trying to have the old bill changed and fairer distribution of cars to amputees, either through a new bill or an amendment to the old one. I find it very hard getting around and need a car as much or more so than a sighted amputee. I spent 2 years in Army hospitals, and besides the loss of a leg and being blinded my other leg is also badly damaged and this adds to my problem of traveling. I know there are hundreds of other veterans like me who were left out of the car bill and are entitled to them just as much as the sighted amputees.

You have my permission to use my case in any way you see fit to help bring about a fair bill on autos for amputees now. We need these cars now and hope Congress will take action before they close this session.

Sincerely yours,

Ex-Tech. Sgt. PHILIP H. HURRELL.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I also ask unanimous consent that the members of the committee and

all Members may extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD if they so wish.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 3493. An act making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3993. An act making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3950. An act to reduce individual income-tax payments; and

H. J. Res. 233. Joint resolution authorizing the President to approve the trusteeship agreement for the Territory of the Pacific Islands.

The Speaker announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1419. An act to enable the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii to authorize the city and county of Honolulu, a municipal corporation, to issue sewer bonds.

BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, a bill and joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 3950. An act to reduce individual income taxes; and

H. J. Res. 233. Joint resolution authorizing the President to approve the trusteeship agreement for the Territory of the Pacific Islands.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 12 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, July 16, 1947, at 11 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

927. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize the transfer of certain troop-kitchen railway cars to the War Department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

928. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting report of proposed transfer of equipment to Junior Naval Reserve Unit, Sanford, Fla.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

929. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting report of proposed transfer of equipment to All Hallows Episcopal Church, Snow Hill, Md.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

930. A letter from the Under Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to provide for the liquidation and dissolution of the Tennessee Valley Associated Cooperatives, Inc.; to the Committee on Agriculture.

931. A letter from the Chairman, Reconstruction Finance Corporation, transmitting a report of activities of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for the month of February 1947; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

932. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a report of a proposed transfer of a picket boat to the United States Coast Guard Auxiliary Flotilla 33, of California; to the Committee on Armed Services.

933. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report on records proposed for disposal by various Government agencies; to the Committee on House Administration.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 1330. A bill to abolish the Jackson Hole National Monument as created by Presidential Proclamation No. 2578, dated March 15, 1943, and to restore the lands belonging to the United States within the exterior boundaries of said monument to the same status held immediately prior to the issuance of said proclamation; with amendments (Rept. No. 914). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. S. 272. An act to provide for the utilization of surplus War Department-owned military real property as national cemeteries, when feasible; without amendment (Rept. No. 915). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. House Resolution 244. Resolution for the initiation of investigations looking to the provision of additional water for southern California and the Colorado River Basin, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 916). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TABER: Committee on Appropriations. House Joint Resolution 240. Joint resolution making temporary appropriations for the fiscal year 1948; without amendment (Rept. No. 917). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 292. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 4127, a bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 918). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 3325. A bill to enable Osage Indians who served in World War II to obtain loans under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 919). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HOPE: Committee on Agriculture. S. 1498. An act to provide support for wool, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 920). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HOPE: Committee on Agriculture. S. 338. An act to amend the Plant Quarantine Act approved August 20, 1912, as amended, by adding thereto a new section; with amendments (Rept. No. 921). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HOPE: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 4124. A bill to amend the peanut marketing quota provisions of the Agricul-

tural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 922). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. REED of Illinois: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3980. A bill to enable debtor railroad corporations expeditiously to effectuate reorganizations of their financial structures; to alter or modify their financial securities; and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 923). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 3834. A bill to authorize a project for the rehabilitation of certain works of the Fort Sumner irrigation district in New Mexico, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 924). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H. R. 3814. A bill to provide for the establishment of a veterans' hospital for Negro veterans at the birthplace of Booker T. Washington in Franklin County, Va.; with an amendment (Rept. No. 925). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ELSTON: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 3417. A bill to provide for the conveyance to Escambia County, State of Florida, of a portion of Santa Rosa Island which is under the jurisdiction of the War Department; with an amendment (Rept. No. 926). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SIKES: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 3735. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of War to donate and convey to Okaloosa County, State of Florida, all the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to a portion of Santa Rosa Island, Fla., and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 927). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. CHAPMAN: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 3632. A bill to extend the time within which applications may be made to the Railroad Retirement Board for certain refunds from the unemployment trust fund; without amendment (Rept. No. 928). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HOWELL: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Senate Concurrent Resolution 14. Concurrent resolution favoring a fair representation of American small businessmen on policy-making bodies created by Executive appointment; without amendment (Rept. No. 929). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. HOPE: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 4110. A bill to amend title I of the act entitled "An act to provide for research into basic laws and principles relating to agriculture and to provide for the further development of cooperative agricultural extension work and the more complete endowment and support of land-grant colleges," approved June 29, 1935 (the Bankhead-Jones Act); without amendment (Rept. No. 930). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. LeCOMPTE: Committee on House Administration. House Concurrent Resolution 70. Concurrent resolution authorizing the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments of the House of Representatives to have printed for its use additional copies of the hearings on the bill H. R. 2319, the National Security Act of 1947; with an amendment (Rept. No. 931).

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BREHM:

H. R. 4200. A bill to provide for, foster, and aid in coordinating research relating to den-

tal diseases and conditions; to establish the National Institute of Dental Research, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. D'EWART:

H. R. 4201. A bill to authorize payments to the public-school district or districts serving the Fort Peck project, Montana, for the education of dependents of persons engaged on that project; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H. R. 4202. A bill to amend the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act so as to authorize the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to purchase loans guaranteed or insured under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WELCH:

H. R. 4203. A bill to establish eligibility for burial in national cemeteries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. BECKWORTH:

H. R. 4204. A bill to amend the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act so as to authorize the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to purchase loans guaranteed or insured under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. DEVITT:

H. R. 4205. A bill to provide for the settlement and payment to certain motor carriers of claims against the United States for damages resulting from Federal possession, control, and operation in time of war of the carriers' transportation systems and properties; to provide for just compensation to such carriers for the use of such transportation systems and properties during such possession, control, and operation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOWNE:

H. R. 4206. A bill to provide for the payment of a uniform allowance to officers of the National Guard of the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 4207. A bill to amend Thirty-second United States Code, section 49, (67 N. D. A.), as amended, to provide for an active-duty status for all United States property and disbursing officers; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. COLE of New York:

H. R. 4208. A bill to amend section 251 of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee:

H. R. 4209. A bill authorizing the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to grant an easement in certain land to the city of Memphis, Tenn., for street-widening purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 4210. A bill to provide for an amendment to chapter 29 of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. BOLTON:

H. R. 4211. A bill to amend section 301 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act so as to prohibit the introduction into interstate commerce of salt, in certain containers, not having a required content of iodides; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MEADE of Kentucky:

H. R. 4212. A bill to provide increased subsistence allowance to veterans pursuing certain courses under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. REED of New York:

H. R. 4213. A bill to change the order of priority for payment out of the German special deposit account, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOFFMAN:

H. R. 4214. A bill to promote the national security by providing for a Secretary of Defense; for a national military establishment; for a Department of the Army, a Department

of the Navy, and a Department of the Air Force; and for the coordination of the activities of the National Military Establishment with other departments and agencies of the Government concerned with the national security; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. KUNKEL:

H. R. 4215. A bill to create the office of Senator at Large in the Senate of the United States for ex-Presidents of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEMKE:

H. R. 4216. A bill to define some acts constituting lack of good behavior within the terms of article III, section 1, of the Constitution of the United States of Justices and judges of courts of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACK:

H. R. 4217. A bill appropriating funds for the construction and equipment of a new school building in the town of Moclips, Grays Harbor County, Wash.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. GRAHAM (by request):

H. J. Res. 239. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States with respect to religious freedom; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TABER:

H. J. Res. 240. Joint resolution making temporary appropriations for the fiscal year 1948; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. MCCORMACK:

H. J. Res. 241. Joint resolution to provide for the preparation of a plan for the participation by the United States in the observance and celebration in Cuba of the fiftieth anniversary of American and Cuban victories in the War with Spain; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ROSS:

H. Con. Res. 72. Concurrent resolution to call a conference for the revision and strengthening of the United Nations Charter; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LODGE:

H. Con. Res. 73. Concurrent resolution establishing a joint committee to investigate high prices of consumer goods; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. FOOTE:

H. Con. Res. 74. Concurrent resolution establishing a joint committee to investigate high prices of consumer goods; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. KNUTSON:

H. Res. 293. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Ways and Means to continue its investigation and study of the internal-revenue laws; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HOFFMAN:

H. Res. 294. Resolution authorizing the printing of 6,000 additional copies of the third intermediate report, entitled "Investigation of the Participation of Federal Officials in the Formation and Operation of Health Workshops"; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. EATON:

H. Res. 295. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Foreign Affairs to conduct studies and investigations of all matters coming within the jurisdiction of that committee and providing for participation by members of other standing committees of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HERTER:

H. Res. 296. Resolution to create a Select Committee on Foreign Aid; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. KNUTSON:

H. Res. 297. Resolution to provide funds for the expenses of the investigation and study authorized by House Resolution 293; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HOPE:

H. Res. 298. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Agriculture to make studies and investigations into matters relating to agriculture; to the Committee on Rules.

this vast project will drain America of her substance to the extent of more than \$20,000,000,000 during the next 5 years. A study is now being made to determine to what extent America can, with safety to our resources and reserves, participate in such a plan.

I do not believe this grave decision will be made this year. I hope not. I want the people of this district and of the entire country to have a chance to think, to read, and to discuss this problem. We need to know the extent of the need, the objectives, and the prospects of such a vast program. I hope it will be debated in every town hall in America before Congress reconvenes in January. Its resolution will require all the thinking and all the information that can be mustered. Every Member of Congress will need the help of the people of his district in making his decision, and, above that, he will need the help and guidance of Him who gave us courage in the grave trial of war, and must now give us wisdom in this grave hour of peace.

No Money for "Down Under"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETE JARMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1947

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Washington Post of July 13, 1947:

NO MONEY FOR "DOWN UNDER"—OUR SILENT SALESMEN ARE GETTING THE GATE

One of America's wartime links with the people of the Southern Hemisphere will be broken this week, by order of the State Department.

Padlocks will be snapped shut Wednesday on the American information libraries in Sydney and Melbourne, Australia. Later this month, similar libraries in Wellington, New Zealand, and Johannesburg and Capetown, South Africa, will close their doors—for lack of funds.

Congress slashed the State Department appropriations so deeply that the department officials decided to abandon the dominion libraries. Each of them cost about \$30,000 a year.

MORE THAN BOOKSHELVES

In the scholarly sense of the word they were not libraries at all. They were primarily reference centers and reading rooms, where anyone seeking facts about any phase of American life could find them in books, periodicals, and Government documents.

To make them accessible they were located on downtown streets to help inquirers, and reference assistants were put in charge.

This was something new in American foreign relations, but it worked. Almost from the moment the Office of War Information established the libraries, visitors crowded in at a rate of about 3,000 a month at each of them. In addition, information rippled out to the press, to universities, and to a public that had learned most of what it knew about America from Hollywood.

Henry Seidel Canby, then editor of the Saturday Review of Literature, was in Melbourne the day President Roosevelt died. He described what happened as follows:

Every newspaper in that part of Australia began to telephone the information library. What was the procedure of installing a new successor? Who would be his successor in case of Mr. Truman's death? What effect constitutionally might this tragedy

have upon American policy? What was the relation of the Chief Executive to Congress? Where had Mr. Truman stood in his political activities? What was he like?

"The result was the best and most accurate and most thoroughly informed newspaper coverage of a world-important event in another country that Americans then resident in Australia had ever seen."

SPARED BY CONGRESS

This was not outright propaganda at all, yet Dr. Canby and others described it as propaganda in the best sense of the word. Every American diplomat stationed in the dominions, and the dominion governments themselves, praised the libraries for what they did to make the United States better understood.

Even in Congress there was seldom the slightest criticism of the libraries, although other activities of the OWI and the State Department were attacked without mercy. The Mundt bill, passed by the House by a 3-to-1 majority, authorizes the continuance of information libraries abroad, and the State Department plans to maintain most of them in Europe and Asia.

Why were the dominion libraries the first to go? Congress did not decree it; department officials decided it on their own. Officials are reticent about the reason, but as nearly as can be gathered they did it because the dominions were farthest from Moscow. Since there was not enough money to continue information work everywhere abroad, it will be continued in those places that are more directly in the path of Soviet penetration and propaganda.

By this process of reasoning, it was judged more important to inform Bulgaria than Australia, Egypt than South Africa, Iraq than New Zealand.

A WARTIME NECESSITY

It was not always so. Early in the war when hundreds of thousands of American troops were stationed in Australia, it became apparent that the dominions had been badly and wrongly informed about the United States. One or two mass-circulation newspapers were distorting American attitudes and policies almost as badly as Communist propaganda in Europe distorts it today. In South Africa there was an active pro-Nazi movement which never ceased its sniping at the United States, especially among the Afrikaans-speaking population.

There was no teaching of American history in the dominions, and precious little knowledge of it. There were few American visitors, and little opportunity to get American books, magazines, or newspapers. With widespread ignorance there was also much suspicion and misunderstanding.

New Zealand still has not a single resident newspaper correspondent in the United States; South Africa has just one; both countries, and Australia, still clamor for the kind of material the libraries supplied. Prof. Ralph H. Gabriel, of Yale, who taught for a year at Sydney, said the other day that their loss would be a disaster.

FERDINAND KUHN, Jr.

Postal Retirement Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1947

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, it is my sincere hope that the so-called Stevenson postal retirement bill, which has now

been reported favorably by the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, will be approved promptly by the Rules Committee and brought to the floor of the House for action before adjournment. This measure has been redrawn to meet certain objections made by some of the members of the Rules Committee. In some respects, notably regarding the elimination of dependent children under 18 from the benefits of the legislation, I regret that this has been necessary.

The bill, however, certainly substantially improves the lot of a group of Federal employees whose faithfulness, devotion to duty, and quality of performance are unsurpassed either in governmental or private employment. This measure will afford to them, at a very slight cost, according to actuarial estimates, a modest increase in their retirement annuity. No one can doubt that this recognition is needed and, in my judgment, richly deserved.

Do We Want a Wool-Growing Industry in This Country?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1947

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the wool industry in the United States is in a very precarious position. It is vitally necessary that this Congress consider carefully and pass the wool bill, which I hope will be before us shortly. If this Congress does not give this needed assistance to this industry, we can expect it to decline still more. This would be disastrous to the country and is something we should not allow. The wool industry is entitled to the protection guaranteed in the bill unanimously reported out by the Agriculture Committee, and I sincerely hope that we will pass this measure before adjournment.

Mr. Speaker, I am inserting at this point in my remarks a statement of facts concerning the sheep industry as compiled by Mr. Carl O. Hansen, secretary of the Montana Wool Growers Association, and published by many papers in my State of Montana. I recommend its reading to the membership because it states briefly our position and the need for assistance by the wool industry:

FACTS CONCERNING THE SHEEP INDUSTRY

(By Carl O. Hansen, secretary, Montana Wool Growers' Association)

MONTANA SHEEP NUMBERS

Sheep numbers in Montana have been declining steadily from nearly 4,000,000 head in 1942 to less than 2,000,000 head at the present time. This alarming liquidation is based on a number of factors, but lack of profit is the principal reason for sheepmen going out of business. Other factors include the labor shortage and the uncertain future for the industry.

UNITED STATES WOOL PRODUCTION

The United States produces, at the present time, only 300,000,000 pounds of wool annu-

ally and our annual consumption for the past several years is approximately 1,000,000,000 pounds. The United States has always depended upon imports to satisfy its demand for wool. In normal times the United States produced approximately two-thirds of its consumption.

WOOL IN TIME OF WAR

Army and Navy officials have testified that a domestic wool industry is absolutely necessary for the proper defense of the country during wartime. They are convinced that something should be done now to assure the United States a strong industry and a suitable reserve of domestic wool. During the war, wool was stock-piled for our security and wool growers were encouraged to stay in the business. To do this the Government purchased all domestic wool at a set price. Now after the war, certain interests not sympathetic with the wool industry are willing to sell the wool grower down the river, since the wartime purpose has been accomplished. Others who are more farsighted realize the need for a healthy domestic wool-growing industry in the event that there might be future wars. Naturally if we are to maintain a wool industry, wool growers will need some type of support, because they have to compete with foreign wool. The British Joint Organization controls the world wool market and can undersell our domestic wool growers within 24 hours' notice no matter what the wool market is in this country. The reason for this is quite simple. The cost of production in this country has risen tremendously since before the war. In Montana these costs have doubled and labor costs have increased 158 percent. Americans have the highest standards of living of any country in the world, so in any kind of times, it will cost more to produce domestic wool than foreign wool.

ESTIMATED INCOME FROM WOOL AND LAMB IN MONTANA

The estimated 1946 income from wool in Montana was \$10,005,000 from 22,234,000 pounds of grease wool. The estimated 1946 income from lamb in Montana was \$18,805,000 for 121,950,000 pounds of lamb.

PREPARATION OF FLEECES

Australian wool is considered approximately 10 cents per pound more valuable than domestic wool of the same grade, due to the superior method of preparing the fleeces for market. The Australians "skirt" all fleeces at the shearing pens. This procedure consists of removing the britch, leg wool and offsorts from the fleeces and packing this wool separately from the main body of the fleece. That makes the fleece uniform which is desirable from a selling standpoint. Australian wool is also graded at the shearing pens.

WOOL IN INTERNATIONAL TRADE

The British Empire has very little to bargain with when it comes to trading with this country with the exception of wool. The Governments of the British Empire appear to have a most selfish motive when trade agreements are discussed as far as wool is concerned. These governments want us to lower our tariff so that they can make this country a dumping ground for that product which is so extensively produced in these countries. They are not satisfied with supplying the United States with the amount of wool which represents the difference between our production and our consumption. However, the wool growers themselves in Australia have made statements supporting our tariffs and want to see our domestic wool growers protected. Our State Department appears willing to lower the tariffs and let the foreign wool come into this country and then subsidize our own domestic industry. There is this point about it. No matter what our domestic market is, the joint organization is going to undersell our wool just enough be-

low our price to obtain the market. As we have said before, the Joint Organization controls the world wool market. They market about 80 percent of the world's apparel wool.

OUR WOOL STOCK PILE

The Government owns over 400,000,000 pounds of grease wool which it has been unable to sell because, according to law, it cannot sell wool at less than parity price. Foreign wool has been selling at a price enough lower to steal the market so the Government has been stock-piling the wool. The Government should be allowed to dispose of this wool at market prices and in an orderly manner so as not to upset the market. This is only fair to our domestic wool growers, because it is not their fault that we have this tremendous stock pile. It is simply an aftermath of war and the industry is a war casualty.

IT BOILS DOWN TO THIS

Do we want a wool-growing industry in this country or not? If we do, the only way we can have one is to give the domestic wool grower enough protection so that he can grow his wool and receive enough for it to pay his operating costs and have a reasonable profit. This can be accomplished by adequate tariff, import quotas or direct Government subsidy. If we do not have a wool-growing industry, it should be remembered that it would weaken the defense of this country and millions of acres of land which are adapted to sheep grazing and sheep grazing alone would be valueless and the source of income from taxes on these lands would be lost.

OPPOSITION TO THE DOMESTIC INDUSTRY

Certain members of the Boston wool trade who have derived substantial profits from handling foreign wool during the war would rather see the domestic wool industry liquidated. Profits to wool handlers on domestic wool since 1943 have been moderate because they were paid on a commission basis. These handlers who have made huge profits prior to the war at the expense of the domestic growers are opposed to a program that would protect the industry.

The wool trade has thousands of dollars to spend lobbying and on publicity that is detrimental to the domestic wool industry. In spite of this opposition, wool-growers' associations were able to convince Congress that their request for protection was based on facts and that the industry does need protection. Even though the wool legislation was turned down by the President, there is still hope of remedial legislation that will protect the industry through 1948.

Expand and Strengthen the ROTC Program in Our State Colleges and Universities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1947

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, the Reserve Officers Training Corps has functioned in the colleges and universities of this Nation for many years and has served to provide trained men for the armed services of our country both in time of peace and war. The ROTC has been a popular and useful arm of service for our Nation's defense and it should be strengthened and expanded. In this

connection, Mr. Speaker, I desire to include a letter from Dr. C. E. Brehm, president of the University of Tennessee at Knoxville, outlining the need for an expanded ROTC program and urging the passage of pending legislation to provide for the effective operation and expansion of the Reserve Officers Training Corps. I urge the members of this Congress to give thoughtful consideration to the contents of Dr. Brehm's message as his opinions represent the views of one of the outstanding educators of our country. The passage of legislation recommended by Dr. Brehm will greatly stimulate volunteer enrollment in the ROTC and serve to strengthen and build up the defense of our country. Action on this and similar needed legislation should be taken prior to the adjournment of the present session of the Congress. The letter is as follows:

THE UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE,

Knoxville, July 8, 1947.

Hon. JOE EVINS,

House of Representatives,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE EVINS: On April 29 there was submitted to the House a bill designated as H. R. 3280 which provides for Army ROTC activities in cooperation with the land-grant colleges. The proposed intent of this bill is to encourage ROTC enrollments in the various colleges of the country in order to provide officers for the Army and at the same time give military training to young men as a part of our whole national defense program.

If this bill is not enacted in this session of Congress, but held over until the next session, it will be rather disastrous for the ROTC program. By that I mean that it will receive a set-back that will require some time to overcome.

The War Department has given the colleges much assurance of the need of the postwar ROTC program and particularly along the lines provided in the ROTC legislation. By virtue of the interest of the War Department in this program and the belief that the proposed legislation would be enacted into law, the colleges have endeavored to encourage in every way young men to participate in the ROTC programs. For example, in cases of students in colleges with ROTC schools pursuing the advance course in military instruction, it is proposed to give each student monetary allowances at a daily rate not exceeding \$1, plus the cost of the garrison ration of the Army for the number of days under instruction during the last 2 years of training.

We have a large number of veterans enrolled in the University who would make excellent officers due in large part to their war experience. Many of these students are unwilling to increase their academic load by taking ROTC courses unless some financial assistance is given. Last summer when it was rumored that postwar ROTC legislation would increase the emoluments to about \$60 per month, we had a large number of applicants for the advanced courses, but when Congress failed to act, most of these students lost interest in the program.

At the present time we are adding three additional units to our program here, Signal Corps, Transportation Corps, and Ordnance, making a total of six units. We may not be able to secure enough students for all of these units if the proposed legislation fails to pass before Congress adjourns.

It is our understanding that there is no real objection to the bill in Congress. It is just one of those that lies in a committee without any action unless someone gets behind it. It is for this reason that I am writing you.

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
Division of Legislative Reports

HEARINGS BEFORE HOUSE RULES COMMITTEE ON H. R. 3465, TO PLACE THE CROP-INSURANCE PROGRAM ON AN EXPERIMENTAL BASIS, AND S. 1498, WOOL PRICE-SUPPORT BILL, JULY 16, 1947

Crop-Insurance Bill:

Chairman Hope of the Agriculture Committee continued his testimony in support of the bill. In response to a question by Rep. Rich as to how long the experimental program should be continued, Rep. Hope said that, if at the end of 3 years we are not "getting somewhere" and "learning something", he will be willing to recommend repeal of the entire program. Rep. Cox asked if hail insurance is not being provided by private enterprises, and Rep. Hope said it was but that the rates were high and only one risk is involved. Reps. Hissley and Harness asked the basis upon which the insurance counties would be selected and said the rest of the country would be paying for benefits to those counties, but Rep. Hope replied that the entire country would benefit from the results of the experiments in those counties. Rep. Harness said there had been several years of experiment, that the program had failed, and that the Act should be repealed; Rep. Hope replied that there has not yet been any true experimentation, that the program has been operated largely on a relief basis. Rep. Cox said the bill represents a "worthy objective" and that, if the Act were repealed entirely, the experience gained to date would be a complete loss.

Rep. Pace spoke in support of the bill, pointing out the corrective provisions of the bill and defending the present program against charges that it has failed; he said more has been paid out for retirement of Federal employees than has been paid for crop insurance and said the crop-insurance program has avoided the necessity of some disaster appropriations, such as those which would have been necessary on account of flood damage. Rep. Rich said that one of the "best things" was that "Anderson fired Wright."

Rep. Hill testified in favor of the bill. In response to a question by Rep. Harness, he said it would be in order on the floor for an amendment to be proposed to repeal the entire Act. Rep. Hill said that, if the program cannot be worked out in the next 2 years with the right kind of management, he'll be in favor of discontinuing it.

In response to a question by Rules Chairman Allen, Rep. Hope said he knew of no opposition to the bill in the Agriculture Committee.

Wool Bill:

Chairman Hope of the Agriculture Committee said the Committee has not changed its views on the vetoed bill but recognizes the legislative situation. In answer to a question by Rep. Wadsworth, Rep. Hope said there would be no wool-price support if the bill is not passed, since wool is neither a basic nor Steagall commodity. Rep. Herter said one argument for the bill is that wool is a critical commodity but that, if this is so, it should be stockpiled, and that the present stockpile is causing the trouble. Rep. Hope indicated that the Army may take over CCC stocks for a stockpile. Rep. Herter criticized CCC's buying and selling operations on wool. Rep. Rich said the stockpile will not disrupt the market much if CCC does not dump it all at once. Rep. Hope said the Agriculture Committee vote was unanimous. Reps. Granger and Barrett spoke briefly in support of the bill.

agencies on notice that the appropriations for the fiscal year 1948--as for any other year--are intended to cover earnings for all the workdays occurring in that year. No deficiency estimates will be considered in future years to cover earnings for workdays carried over from prior years."

Foreign relief. "This committee and Congress have more than shown a desire to extend the hand of fellowship to peoples of the world, but it must be remembered that there is a limit to the resources of this country and the governments of the other countries must not expect that relief from the United States is limitless. Ways must be found for the peoples of other lands to become self-supporting."

Employees' loyalty. "The committee has not acted on the matter in this bill inasmuch as there is now pending in Congress a bill on this subject which, when enacted, will be in substitution for the program as outlined by the President's Executive order. It was felt that considerable revisions would probably be made in several of the items in the estimate, the exact details of which will have to be determined after the final enactment of the pending bill."

Lend-lease. "The committee feels that the various departments concerned should have the settlement of this program, and the accounts involved, much nearer completion than appears to be the case. There is no justification for allowing it to drag out for several years as could easily be done if Congress were willing to maintain a force to keep it going. The committee...wishes to urge on all the Departments...concerned the utmost necessity of winding up this program at the earliest possible date."

Foreign relief. "The committee has made this reduction because, of the requirements that were estimated to be needed, this amount represented the sum intended to go to certain countries which have not shown a disposition to comply with the requirements of the act authorizing the appropriation."

"The committee was not at all favorably impressed by some of the programs carried on overseas, particularly those which involve the so-called cultural program."

Foot-and-mouth disease. "The Committee...is convinced of the absolute necessity of eradicating this disease before it reaches our own country and is willing to make every necessary provision for that purpose. However,...the committee is unwilling to make additional appropriations of considerable sums on the basis of the varying estimates of cost... The committee...looks to the Secretary to see that the job is done as rapidly as possible at a minimum cost"

Sugar rationing. "It is hoped that the program will be ended at the earliest possible date."

Bureau of Federal Supply. "The committee has denied a request...for the so-called Federal cataloging system. It appears that the various agencies...are not working along properly coordinated lines in planning this program and the committee is therefore rejecting this request. It would seem more appropriate, if the Departments expect to obtain congressional approval, that they get together and lay out a plan upon which all are in reasonable agreement and present it to Congress at some future date with a definite showing of advantages and economies expected to accrue... A request was made for an additional \$2,000,000 to augment the general supply fund. The committee has denied this request and would suggest to the Bureau of Federal Supply that it is probably keeping too large an inventory at the present time and could make considerably more money available if it would take steps to speed up its collections of money due from the various agencies to whom supplies are furnished." (Regarding the stockpiling item) "The committee cautions the Bureau of Federal Supply...and urges it to be particularly careful to see to it that the Government does not acquire perishable items unless there is substantial reason to believe that there is immediate need therefor...It is the wish of the committee that the authorities...proceed with the utmost caution and acquire this material at such

a rate as not to cause any undue reaction in the market price."

3. WOOL-PRICE SUPPORTS. The Rules Committee reported a resolution for consideration of S. 1498, the wool bill (p. 9488).
4. CROP INSURANCE. The Rules Committee reported a resolution for consideration of H. R. 3465, to place the crop-insurance program on an experimental basis (p. 9488).
5. TAXATION. Passed H. R. 3950, the tax-reduction bill, over the President's veto by a 299-108 vote (pp. 9467-70). The Senate later sustained the veto by a 57-36 vote, which was short of the 2/3 requirement (pp. 9425-48).
6. FARM PRODUCTION. Rep. Miller, Nebr., inserted a Sidney (Nebr.) Telegraph editorial, "Gas scarcity looms as harvest threat" (pp. 9458-9).
7. HOUSING INVESTIGATION. The Rules Committee reported a resolution (H. Con. Res. 104, H. Rept. 997) to establish a Joint Committee on Housing to investigate the housing situation (pp. 9487-8).
8. FOREIGN RELIEF. The Rules Committee reported resolutions to provide for a Select Committee on Foreign Aid and to authorize the Foreign Affairs Committee to investigate foreign-relief needs (p. 9488).
9. RFC APPROPRIATIONS. Passed without amendment H. R. 4268, which includes 1948 funds for RFC (pp. 9503-4).
10. PLANT QUARANTINE. In reporting S. 338 (see Digest 135), regarding nursery-stock imports, the Agriculture Committee struck out the provision regarding bulbs and the phrase "for propagation purposes."

SENATE - July 18

11. WAR POWERS. Agreed to the House amendments to S. J. Res. 123, terminating certain war and emergency powers (pp. 9404-5). This measure will now be sent to the President.

Among the House amendments were deletion of the provision repealing ODE powers.

Other provisions of the measure, as finally passed, of interest to this Department are as follows:

<u>Item</u>	<u>Committee Comment</u>
a. Authority of the Secretary of Agriculture to inspect meat-packing establishments engaged only in intrastate commerce, until 6 months after the war.	Operations already have been ended.
b. Expenditures up to \$1,000,000 a year authorized for forest-fire control, without matching of funds, during the emergency.	No appropriations were made for the fiscal years 1947 or 1948.
c. Authority for the Secretary of Agriculture to encourage expansion of production of nonbasic agricultural	Would not relieve the Department of necessity for maintaining a price through Dec. 31, 1948, for producers

CONSIDERATION OF H. R. 1498

JULY 18, 1947.—Referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following

REPORT

[To accompany H. Res. 315]

The Committee on Rules, having had under consideration House Resolution 315, report the same to the House with the recommendation that the resolution do pass.



THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

House Calendar No. 144

80TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. RES. 315

[Report No. 1001]

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

JULY 18, 1947

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following resolution; which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed

RESOLUTION

1 *Resolved*, That immediately upon the adoption of this
2 resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve
3 itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of
4 the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 1498) to pro-
5 vide support for wool, and for other purposes, and all points
6 of order against said bill are hereby waived. That after
7 general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and con-
8 tinue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and con-
9 trolled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the
10 Committee on Agriculture, the bill shall be read for amend-
11 ment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the
12 consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall

1 rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments
 2 as may have been adopted and the previous question shall
 3 be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto
 4 to final passage without intervening motion except one motion
 5 to recommit.

House Calendar No. 144

80TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. RES. 315

[Report No. 1001]

RESOLUTION

Providing for the consideration of the bill
 (S. 1498) to provide support for wool and
 for other purposes.

By Mr. ALLEN of Illinois

JULY 18, 1947

Referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be
 printed

Elsaesser	Kersten, Wis.	Reeves
Elston	Kilburn	Rich
Engel, Mich.	Knutson	Riehlman
Fallon	Kunkel	Robison
Fellows	Landis	Rockwell
Fenton	Latham	Rogers, Mass.
Fletcher	LeFevre	Rohrbough
Foot	Lesinski	Ross
Fulton	Lewis	Russell
Gamble	Lodge	Sadlak
Gavin	Love	St. George
Gearhart	McConnell	Sanborn
Gillette	McCowan	Sarbacher
Gillie	McDonough	Schwabe, Okla.
Goff	McDowell	Scoblick
Goodwin	McGarvey	Scott, Hardie
Graham	McGregor	Scott,
Grant, Ind.	McMahon	Hugh D., Jr.
Griffiths	McMillen, Ill.	Scrivner
Gross	Mack	Seely-Brown
Gwinn, N. Y.	MacKinnon	Shafer
Hale	Macy	Short
Hall,	Maloney	Simpson, Pa.
Leonard W.	Mason	Smith, Kans.
Halleck	Mathews	Smith, Maine
Harness, Ind.	Meade, Ky.	Smith, Wis.
Herter	Meade, Md.	Snyder
Heselton	Merrow	Springer
Hess	Meyer	Stanley
Hill	Michener	Stefan
Hinshaw	Miller, Conn.	Stevenson
Hoffman	Miller, Md.	Stockman
Holmes	Miller, Nebr.	Stratton
Horan	Mitchell	Sundstrom
Howell	Morton	Taber
Jackson, Calif.	Muhlenberg	Taylor
Javits	Murray, Wis.	Tibbott
Jenison	Nixon	Tolefsen
Jenkins, Ohio	Nodar	Towe
Jenkins, Pa.	Norblad	Twyman
Jennings	O'Hara	Vail
Jensen	Owens	Van Zandt
Johnson, Calif.	Patterson	Vorys
Johnson, Ill.	Phillips, Calif.	Vursell
Johnson, Ind.	Phillips, Tenn.	Wadsworth
Jones, Ohio	Ploeser	Welch
Jones, Wash.	Plumley	Welch
Jonkman	Potts	Wigglesworth
Judd	Poulson	Wilson, Ind.
Kean	Ramey	Wolcott
Kearns	Reed, Ill.	Wolverton
Keating	Reed, N. Y.	Woodruff
Keefe	Rees	Youngblood

NAYS—171

Abernethy	Evins	Lea
Albert	Feighan	LeCompte
Allen, La.	Fernandez	Lemke
Andrews, Ala.	Fisher	Lucas
Barden	Flannagan	Lusk
Bates, Ky.	Fogarty	Lyle
Battle	Folger	Lynch
Beckworth	Forand	McCormack
Bell	Gary	McMillan, S. C.
Blatnik	Gathings	Madden
Bloom	Gordon	Mahon
Boggs, La.	Gore	Manasco
Brooks	Gorski	Mansfield
Brown, Ga.	Gossett	Marcantonio
Bryson	Granger	Martin, Iowa
Buchanan	Grant, Ala.	Miller, Calif.
Bulwinkle	Gregory	Mills
Burleson	Hagen	Monroney
Byrne, N. Y.	Hand	Morgan
Camp	Hardy	Morris
Cannon	Harless, Ariz.	Morrison
Carroll	Harris	Mundt
Chelf	Harrison	Murdock
Clark	Hart	Murray, Tenn.
Colmer	Havener	O'Brien
Combs	Hedrick	O'Konski
Cooley	Hendricks	Pace
Cooper	Hobbs	Passman
Courtney	Hoeben	Peden
Cox	Holifield	Peterson
Cravens	Hope	Philbin
Crosser	Huber	Pickett
Cunningham	Hull	Poage
Davis, Ga.	Jackson, Wash.	Preston
Davis, Tenn.	Jarman	Price, Fla.
Dawson, Ill.	Johnson, Okla.	Price, Ill.
Deane	Jones, Ala.	Priest
Delaney	Jones, N. C.	Rains
Dingell	Karsten, Mo.	Rankin
Dolliver	Kearney	Rayburn
Domengeaux	Kefauver	Rayfiel
Donohue	Kennedy	Redden
Dorn	Keogh	Richards
Doughton	Kerr	Rizley
Douglas	Kilday	Robertson
Drewry	King	Rogers, Fla.
Durham	Klein	Rooney
Eberharter	Lane	Sadowski
Elliott	Lanham	Sasser
Engle, Calif.	Larcade	Schwabe, Mo.

Sikes	Talle	Whittington
Simpson, Ill.	Teague	Williams
Smathers	Thomas, Tex.	Wilson, Tex.
Smith, Va.	Trimble	Winstead
Somers	West	Wood
Spence	Wheeler	Worley
Stigler	Whitten	Zimmerman

NOT VOTING—41

Bennett, Mich.	Gwynne, Iowa	O'Toole
Bland	Hall,	Patman
Bonner	Edwin Arthur	Pfeifer
Boykin	Hartley	Powell
Brown, Ohio	Hays	Rabin
Buckley	Hebert	Riley
Celler	Heffernan	Rivers
Chapman	Johnson, Tex.	Sabath
Clements	Kee	Sheppard
Cole, Mo.	Kelley	Smith, Ohio
Eaton	Kirwan	Thomas, N. J.
Fuller	Ludlow	Thomason
Gallagher	Norrell	Vinson
Gifford	Norton	Walter

So the motion was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Additional general pairs:

Mr. Thomas of New Jersey with Mr. Walter.

Mr. Hartley with Mr. Riley.

Mr. Bennett of Michigan with Mr. Chapman.

Mr. Gwynne of Iowa with Mr. Rivers.

Mr. Martin of Iowa with Mr. Clements.

Mr. Eaton with Mr. Hays.

Mr. Gifford with Mr. Bonner.

Mr. Smith of Ohio with Mr. Johnson of Texas.

Mr. Edwin Arthur Hall with Mr. Vinson.

Mr. Brown of Ohio with Mr. Kee.

Mr. Gallagher with Mr. Bland.

Mr. Cole of Missouri with Mr. Kirwan.

Mr. Fuller with Mr. Boykin.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts and Mr. REED of Illinois changed their votes from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON HOUSING

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Con. Res. 104, Rept. No. 997), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there is hereby established a joint congressional committee to be known as the Joint Committee on Housing (hereafter referred to as the committee), and to be composed of seven Members of the Senate who are members of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency to be appointed by the President pro tempore of the Senate, and seven Members of the House of Representatives who are members of the House of Representatives Committee on Banking and Currency to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. A vacancy in the membership of the committee shall not affect the powers of the remaining members to execute the functions of the committee, and shall be filled in the same manner as the original selection. The committee shall select a chairman and a vice chairman from among its members.

SEC. 2. The committee, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, shall conduct a thorough study and investigation of the entire field of housing, including but not limited to—

(1) the extent of the need for housing in the United States as a whole and in all areas thereof;

(2) the extent, if any, to which shortages in building materials are contributing to the shortage of housing;

(3) the reasons for the existing high costs of building materials and housing and the

action which may be taken to reduce such costs;

(4) all factors of whatever kind of nature which contribute to the existing high costs of housing and which prevent the speedy construction of adequate housing to satisfy the needs of the Nation and the action which may be taken to eliminate such factors;

(5) the extent to which archaic building codes and zoning laws contribute to the existing shortage and excessive cost of housing;

(6) the administration and operation of existing Federal laws relating to slum clearance, insurance of mortgages on housing, home loans, guaranties of veterans' housing loans, construction permits, veterans' preference in the renting and purchase of housing, rent control, and all other matters relating to housing;

(7) the availability of private capital and of Government loans to finance the construction of housing;

(8) the organization and operations of Federal, State, and municipal government agencies concerned with housing; and

(9) such other problems and subjects in the field of housing as the committee deems appropriate.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report to the Senate and the House of Representatives not later than March 15, 1948, the results of its study and investigation, together with such recommendations as to necessary legislation and such other recommendations as it may deem advisable.

SEC. 4. The committee shall have the power, without regard to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, to employ and fix the compensation of such officers, experts, and employees as it deems necessary for the performance of its duties, including consultants who shall receive compensation at a rate not to exceed \$35 for each day actually spent by them in the work of the committee, together with their necessary travel and subsistence expenses. The committee is further authorized, with the consent of the head of the department or agency concerned, to utilize the services, information, facilities, and personnel of all agencies in the executive branch of the Government and may request the governments of the several States, representatives of business, industry, finance, and labor, and such other persons, agencies, organizations, and instrumentalities as it deems appropriate to attend its hearings and to give and present information, advice, and recommendations.

SEC. 5. The committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Eightieth Congress; to require by subpoena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents; to administer oaths, to take such testimony; to have such printing and binding done; and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services in reporting such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per 100 words. Subpenas shall be issued under the signature of the chairman or vice chairman of the committee and shall be served by any person designated by them.

SEC. 6. The members of the committee shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties vested in the committee, other than expenses in connection with meetings of the committee held in the District of Columbia during such times as the Congress is in session.

SEC. 7. The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed \$100,000, shall be paid one-half from the contingent fund of the

Senate and one-half from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives upon vouchers signed by the chairman. Disbursements to pay such expenses shall be made by the Secretary of the Senate out of the contingent fund of the Senate, such contingent fund to be reimbursed from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives in the amount of one-half of disbursements so made.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AID

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 296, Rept. No. 998), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Whereas the importance and complexity of aid required by foreign nations and peoples from the resources of the United States is assuming increasing proportions; and

Whereas such aid directly affects every segment of the domestic economy of the United States; and

Whereas the problems relating to such aid are of a nature to lie within the jurisdiction of a number of the standing committees of the Congress; and

Whereas these problems should, in order to safeguard the resources and economy of the United States, be given the most careful consideration in relation to each other; and

Whereas an integrated and coordinated study should be most valuable to the standing committees of the Congress: Therefore be it

Resolved, That there is hereby created a select committee on foreign aid composed of 19 Members of the House of Representatives, who shall be appointed by the Speaker. The Speaker shall designate one of the members of the select committee as chairman. Any vacancy occurring in the membership of the select committee shall be filled in the manner in which the original appointment was made

The committee is authorized and directed to make a study of (1) actual and prospective needs of foreign nations and peoples, including those within United States military zones, both for relief in terms of food, clothing, and so forth, and of economic rehabilitation; (2) resources and facilities available to meet such needs within and without the continental United States; (3) existing or contemplated agencies, whether private, public, domestic, or international, qualified to deal with such needs; (4) any or all measures which might assist in assessing relative needs and in correlating such assistance as the United States can properly make without weakening its domestic economy.

The committee shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) from time to time as it shall deem appropriate, but finally not later than March 1, 1948.

For the purposes of this resolution the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places, either within or without the continental limits of the United States, whether or not the House is sitting, has recessed, or has adjourned, to employ such personnel, to borrow from Government departments and agencies such special assistants, to hold such hearings, and to take such testimony, as it deems necessary.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 3, line 4, after the word "adjourned," strike out the words "to employ such personnel, to borrow from Government departments and agencies such special assistants."

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 295, Rept.

No. 999), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Whereas the Committee on Foreign Affairs was established in 1822, and by the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (1) has been given jurisdiction as a standing committee over relations of the United States with foreign nations generally, and (2) is charged to exercise continuous watchfulness over the execution by the Department of State and other agencies of the United States Government of the laws relating to the relations of the United States with foreign nations generally; and

Whereas the foreign policy of the United States today assumes new importance in the operations of the entire economic system of the United States and conditions the survival of free institutions both at home and abroad; and

Whereas the Committee on Foreign Affairs has, by its reorganization in conformity with the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, by setting up the appropriate staff and subcommittee organization to deal with the heavy new burden imposed upon it to make recommendations to the House of Representatives on policy issues affecting foreign affairs and on the necessary legislative action: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Committee on Foreign Affairs, acting as a whole or by subcommittees is authorized and directed to conduct studies and investigations of all matters coming within the jurisdiction of such committee.

SEC. 2. That in projects for studies of matters concerning the foreign affairs of the United States which in the judgment of the Committee on Foreign Affairs require investigations by it abroad, the committee is authorized to include the services and travel of the requisite staff and clerical help, to accompany subcommittees of the Committee on Foreign Affairs on such investigations or study missions abroad.

SEC. 3. That in making such studies and investigations abroad, it shall be the duty of such subcommittees of the Committee on Foreign Affairs to keep current records and to make reports to the Committee on Foreign Affairs for appropriate legislative action, on the completion of any such mission, of the results of such studies and investigations, together with such recommendations as may be deemed desirable.

For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, or any subcommittees thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places as the committee may determine, whether or not the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents by subpoena or otherwise, and to take testimony, as it deems necessary. Subpoenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee and shall be served by any person designated by such chairman. The chairman of the committee or any member thereof may administer oaths to witnesses.

AMENDING THE FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE ACT

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 314, Rept. No. 1000), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3465) to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the

bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

CONTINUING SUPPORT FOR WOOL

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 315, Rept. No. 1001), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 1498) to provide support for wool, and for other purposes, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendment as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

MINORITY VIEWS ON H. R. 29

Mr. PICKETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to file minority views on the bill H. R. 29.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time in order to say that I have talked with the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, and he has informed me that the deficiency appropriation bill is in order for consideration. It is of great importance. I think it is highly desirable that we act on it this evening, if at all possible.

I take this time to express the hope that we can proceed expeditiously with the consideration of the matter now before us, and then take up the deficiency bill and dispose of it yet this evening.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CANNON. I am glad to have the distinguished majority leader take that position. An hour or two saved now will



HOUSE - July 25

12. WOOL-PRICE SUPPORTS. Debated S. 1498, to provide for price supports on wool (pp. 10336-41).
13. CROP INSURANCE. Passed as reported S. 1326, to place the crop-insurance program on a limited, largely experimental, basis (pp. 10296-302). Reps. Hope, Andresen, Hill, Flannagan, and Cooley, and Sens. Aiken, Bushfield, Young, Ellender, and Stewart were appointed conferees (pp. 10302, 10401-2).
14. AGRICULTURE STUDIES. Agreed, without amendment, to H. Res. 317, to authorize the House Agriculture Committee to spend not over \$50,000 for the long-range farm-program studies authorized in H. Res. 298 (p. 10276). (The Congressional Record does not indicate whether this resolution was agreed to or not, but the "Daily Digest" states that it was agreed to.)
15. WEED KILLERS. Agreed, without amendment, to H. Res. 276, which requests the Secretary of Agriculture (1) to make known that 2,4-D can be used only with extreme caution, (2) to investigate and determine what crops it harms and how far the dust will carry and have harmful effects, (3) to determine whether existing supplies can be mixed with other chemicals in a preparation which will not be harmful to cotton, etc., and (4) to make known the results of these investigations (pp. 10288-9).
16. FOREIGN AFFAIRS. Passed with amendment H. R. 4168, to provide for reincorporation of the Institute of Inter-American Affairs (pp. 10303-4).
Agreed, without amendment, to H. Res. 332, to provide for a select Committee on Foreign Aid to study the need for assistance to foreign countries (pp. 10277-8).
Agreed, without amendment, to H. Res. 331, to provide for investigations of foreign-affairs matters by the Foreign Affairs Committee (p. 10277).
17. PUBLIC WORKS. Agreed, without amendment, to H. Res. 259, to provide for public-works investigations and surveys by the Public Works Committee (p. 10277).
18. INFORMATION. Agreed, without amendment, to H. Res. 333, providing for an investigation of Federal-agency propaganda and publicity activities, by the Expenditures in the Executive Departments Committee (p. 10278).
19. SURPLUS PROPERTY. Agreed, without amendment, to H. Res. 334, to authorize the Expenditures in the Executive Departments Committee to investigate surplus-property disposition (p. 10278).
20. ACCOUNTING. Passed as reported S. 1350, which authorizes GAO, if in concurrence of the department concerned, to relieve any disbursing or other accountable officer or agent or former disbursing or other accountable officer or agent of any department or agency charged with responsibility on account of physical loss or deficiency for any reason of Government funds, vouchers, checks, etc., if the department head determines that (1) the loss or deficiency occurred in the discharge of official duties or by reason of an act or omission by a subordinate and (2) without fault or negligence, but that this authority shall not include illegal or erroneous payments (p. 10286). The Senate later concurred in the House amendments (p. 10401). This bill will now be sent to the President.
21. FARM BANKRUPTCY. Passed without amendment H. R. 4326, to extend the Farm

Bankruptcy Act until Mar. 1, 1948 (p. 10287).

22. (Item cancelled.)

23. PERSONNEL. Passed without amendment S. 1494, to amend the Veterans' Preference Act so as to make it mandatory for administrative officers to take corrective action recommended by the Civil Service Commission in cases of appeals of preference eligibles (p. 10288). This bill will now be sent to the President.
24. WATER POLLUTION. Passed without amendment S. 1418, granting Congress' consent to an interstate compact for water-pollution control in New England (pp. 10289-91). This bill will now be sent to the President.
25. FISHERIES. Concurred in the Senate amendment to H. R. 859, to provide for exploration, investigation, development, and maintenance of fishing resources, etc. (pp. 10293-4). This bill will now be sent to the President.
26. FOREST LANDS. Passed without amendment S. 1505, to direct the transfer to Boise, Idaho, of 9 lots of a 5-acre tract of land donated to the Government by Boise and now used by the Forest Service as a site for central repair shops (pp. 10304-5). This bill will now be sent to the President.
27. PHILIPPINE REHABILITATION. Passed as reported S. 1020, which makes various amendments to the Philippine Rehabilitation Act, including authority for the Philippine War Damage Commission to call on any department or agency of the U. S. Government for assistance (pp. 10315-21). Conferees were appointed in both Houses (pp. 10321, 10401).
28. WAR DEPARTMENT CIVIL APPROPRIATION BILL. House conferees were appointed on this bill, H. R. 4002 (p. 10280).
29. COMMITTEE STAFFS. The Agriculture, Appropriations, Expenditures, Post Office and Civil Service, and other Committees submitted lists of the names and salaries of their employees (pp. 10357-63).
30. FCA AUDIT. Received from GAO the audit report on FCA corporations (H. Doc. 417 to Expenditures in the Executive Departments Committee (p. 10356).
31. PERSONNEL. The Post Office and Civil Service Committee reported without amendment H. R. 4236, to remove certain discrimination with respect to appointment of persons with physical handicaps to civil-service positions (H. Rept. 1092) (p. 10356).
32. TRANSPORTATION. The Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee reported with amendments H. R. 221, to amend the Interstate Commerce Act regarding certain agreements among carriers (H. Rept. 1100) (p. 10357).
33. FLOOD CONTROL. Received the War Department's report on a flood-control survey of the Mo. River in N. Dak.; to Public Works Committee (p. 10356).

BILLS INTRODUCED - July 25

34. RESEARCH. S. 1726, by Sen. Gurney, S. Dak., to amend the act relating to preventing publication of inventions in the national interest; to Judiciary

tion inefficiencies. This is not a valid argument in the textile industry for a very simple reason; a reason which has been overlooked completely by proponents of tariff reduction because of ignorance, prejudice, or both.

Textiles, except where man-made fibers, such as rayon, nylon, are concerned, involve the processing of wool and cotton. No one has been able to raise sheep so that the hair on each is the same weight, length, and strength as that on the sheep next to it. Cotton, too, varies greatly from field to field, from season to season, and boll to boll.

Textiles deal with a product which is as variable as New England weather. It cannot be controlled as it is possible to manipulate the texture, hardness, or particular quality wanted in steel.

Textile plants are efficient

The charge of inefficiency cannot stand when knowledge is brought into the picture.

Here then, are the questions:

Is the textile manufacturer wrong to fight for his survival?

Is the automobile manufacturer right to fight to enlarge his industry, his export trade at the expense of textiles?

Is the politician right in expressing himself in terms of prosperity for his own constituency, the rest of the country be damned?

Is the Department of State right in concerning itself with the unemployed of the world when the death of the textile and other industries is at stake with the consequent unemployment or displacement of millions of our own workers?

What are the answers?

Loss: \$24,000,000,000

Ten million unemployed workers, at \$1.20 an hour in the United States means a reduction in the national income of \$24,000,000,000. This does not take into consideration the additional losses because of decreased buying power, or lost taxes. These same 10,000,000 unemployed in England at 35 cents an hour reduce that country's income by only \$7,000,000,000. In Japan, India, or China, the loss in income would be a mere two to three billion dollars or less.

Would it not mean more to the United States, and to the world, to keep those 10,000,000 people working right here than it would be to have 10,000,000 persons employed somewhere else in the world?

Two million unemployed in England, four million in France, Germany, and Poland; and four more million in India, China, and Japan, would have little effect on world economy.

But in the United States, 10,000,000 unemployed could spell depression and economic chaos in the world. Certainly these countries might have more foreign exchange to purchase goods here, but there is no assurance it would be all spent here; and even if it were, it would be but a drop in the bucket as compared to the \$24,000,000,000 lost.

Would you care to decree the death of the seventh largest employer of labor in the United States, the textile industry, holding out only the wild-eyed promise that ultimately those thousands of persons now employed in that industry—who would be unemployed by its demise—would be absorbed into the remaining plants?

Would crush small towns

It is a great industry made up of small units. Many of these are responsible for the welfare of the villages in which they are situated. All together, they form a vital part of our national economy.

The textile industry depends on the tariff for its very life, and will continue to do so until technical advances reduce unit labor costs to compete with cheap foreign labor.

I use the textile industry as an example, because it is the one with which I am fa-

miliar. But many more industries ride in our boat. They need tariff protection, too.

Under present conditions, with tariffs at their present levels, England can ship cloth into our domestic markets and undersell American manufacturers. What good can accrue from a further lowering of the tariff?

Shield in time of war

Imagine the United States facing another crisis as it did in 1941 with a weak or negligible textile industry dependent on foreign sources for the uses of textiles in wartime.

The retention of strong armed forces is urged and draws little disagreement from informed sources. Yet many would nullify the effectiveness of those forces by weakening one of the principal sources of its supply.

America can help the world only if America can remain prosperous. Weakening certain industries to expand others is certainly not the way to keep America prosperous.

[From Modern Industry of July 15, 1947]

LANDSLIDE VOTE FOR RECIPROCAL TRADE

By a thumping majority of 81 to 19 percent, readers of Modern Industry from coast to coast voted "Yes" to the April 15 Debate in Print: Should the reciprocal trade-agreements program be continued?

C. A. Richards, director, export division, Interchemical Corp., New York, upheld the affirmative in that debate. He argued that no United States industry has suffered under the agreements; and that we can compete with foreign products, despite our higher labor costs, because of our greater manufacturing know-how.

Harold J. Walter, president, Uxbridge Worsted Co., Inc., Uxbridge, Mass., for the negative, maintained that lower tariffs would cripple many United States industries and kill the textile industry. We can help the world only if our industries remain sound.

Typical comments from voters agreeing with the "yes" side:

"By exporting, our manufacturers can maintain high production. But we cannot export unless we import in proportion."
* * * "Extension of world trade is best assurance of peace."

"No" side: "Reciprocity in these agreements benefits other countries only."
* * * "We have too high a standard of living to trade with other countries under a low tariff."

The area-by-area vote:

	<i>"Yes"</i> percent
New England.....	69.6
Mid-Atlantic.....	84.5
North Central.....	85.5
South.....	75.0
Midwest.....	75.4
Mountain and Pacific coast.....	78.8

	<i>"No"</i> percent
New England.....	30.4
Mid-Atlantic.....	15.5
North Central.....	14.5
South.....	25.0
Midwest.....	24.6
Mountain and Pacific coast.....	21.2

Congressmen and key Washington officials have already received these results.

(Mr. LESINSKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article written by Mr. Lyons in the Polish Review of July 10, 1947.)

AMENDMENT OF PHILIPPINE REHABILITATION ACT OF 1946 AS AMENDED

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 1020) to amend the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946, as

amended, insist on the amendment of the House and ask for a conference.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. VORYS, JUNE, FULTON, MANSFIELD, and ROGERS of Florida.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I wish to ask the gentleman from Minnesota a question.

The SPEAKER. The time for the reservation of objections is past. The Chair had put the request, and it was agreed to.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RICH. May I ask the gentleman from Minnesota a question with reference to the bill?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman may do so by unanimous consent.

Mr. RICH. Then I ask unanimous consent to do so.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I think we ought to go along in the regular way. I object to the consent request coming at this time.

STAMP COMMEMORATIVE OF THE HUNDREDTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE POULTRY INDUSTRY IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House Resolution 246, to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorative of the one-hundredth anniversary of the poultry industry in the United States.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the Postmaster General is authorized and directed to prepare for issuance, during 1948, a special series of 3-cent postage stamps, of such design as he shall prescribe, in commemoration of the one-hundredth anniversary of the poultry industry in the United States.

Mr. SADLAK. As an outstanding branch of agriculture and figuring prominently in our everyday life the poultry industry proudly points to 100 years of service.

The oldest poultry show in the world got its start in Boston, Mass., and January 20 to the 24, 1948, inclusive, is set aside for the Boston Poultry Show marking a century of poultry progress. This exposition will cover every branch of the industry including breeding, processing, marketing of poultry, and great exhibits of live birds from every State in the Union. The entire Mechanics Building covering a solid city block has been engaged for the event. I understand that national organizations connected with the poultry industry have already scheduled their official annual meetings to coincide with this occasion.

And so we are approaching the centennial of the first organized effort in be-

half of the poultry business which has developed to such a degree that it ranks second only, in money value, to the dairy industry.

A most interesting comment on this resolution appeared in the Baltimore Sun on Thursday morning, July 24, 1947 written by the Associated Press from Washington, as follows:

**PROPOSED STAMP WOULD GIVE CHICKENS
MUCH TO CACKLE ABOUT**

WASHINGTON, JULY 23.—The 1,000,000,000 chickens in the country soon may have something they really can cackle and crow about.

For Representative SADLAK, Republican, of Connecticut, has just introduced into Congress a resolution calling for a special stamp in the chickens' honor.

SADLAK did this at the request of Paul Ives, editor of Cackle and Crow magazine published at New Haven, Conn. Ives naturally is quite excited because exactly 100 years ago this Nation had its first poultry show.

Want to talk about progress? Want to talk about tremendous achievements? Well, then, talk about chickens.

LAND OF OPPORTUNITY

"Like many other immigrants," says the Department of Agriculture in a tribute to its feathered friends, "the modern chicken has found the United States a land of opportunity."

And indeed it has. Few chickens ever think much about it now, but their ancestors came from the jungles—from New Guinea, Java, and Malaya.

They were taken to Europe, and from there to the American colonies.

SOME FEATHERY FACTS

And now for some feathery facts:

Farmers get \$3,000,000,000 from their chicken crop each year.

Like a mattress tester, a hen can get ahead by laying down on the job. But she once figured that 86 eggs were a year's work. The average now has been boosted to 113, and in good flocks smart chicks do twice that well.

A gizzard has nothing to do with a chicken's digestion. A rooster had one removed, felt fine, lived four more years.

An eating chicken soon may be built to specifications. A national grocery company decided it wanted an ideal chicken, and offered a reward for same.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution would authorize and direct the Postmaster General to issue, during 1948, a special series of 3-cent postage stamps, of such design as he shall prescribe, in commemoration of the one hundredth anniversary of the poultry industry in the United States.

In the opinion of the committee, wherein there was unanimous approval, this industry, which has made such rapid progress and which constitutes such an important segment of our economic life, merits this recognition.

Mr. FOOTE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to say a few words in favor of House Joint Resolution 246 submitted by my colleague, ANTONI N. SADLAK, calling for the issuance of a special stamp by the Post Office Department in commemoration of the one-hundredth birthday anniversary of the poultry business in the United States. A hundred years ago the oldest poultry show in the world started in Boston and there the interest in poultry was born which has grown throughout the years and developed this gigantic industry. It produced nearly \$3,000,000,000 during 1946 in the United States. Among all farm interests it is exceeded only by

the great dairy interest. In Connecticut it heads the list of all industries by a wide margin. As an old poultryman myself, and a life long friend of Paul Ives, editor of Cackle and Crow, one of the leading poultry papers in the United States, who is also chairman of the show committee for the one-hundredth Boston poultry show, I wholeheartedly support this legislation.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONTINUING SUPPORT FOR WOOL

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Rules Committee I call up House Resolution 315, providing for the consideration of the bill (S. 1498) to provide support for wool, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 1498) to provide support for wool, and for other purposes, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Colorado is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois and yield such time as I may use.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Colorado is recognized.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, this resolution makes in order the consideration of S. 1498, which is a bill to support the price of wool until December 31, 1948. This is an open rule providing for 1 hour of general debate.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think any extended explanation of this bill is necessary. We have had wool legislation before us previously this year. A similar bill passed the House on May 23. It was vetoed by the President on June 26. On the same day the Senate passed this bill before us today.

The first bill contained a provision which was objectionable to the President. I think the President should have signed the first bill. However, if we are going to continue the price-support program for wool we must pass this bill. I do not like it as well as the first bill, but we have no alternative.

The purpose of this bill is to direct the Commodity Credit Corporation to continue the wool price support program that expired on April 15, 1947. Since that date the Government has not supported the price of wool. I understand some of the finer grades of wool have

been selling at good prices and there has been a ready market for the same. However, the cheaper grades of wool have not been moving and there will be no market for these types of wool until this legislation is passed.

The bill also provides that the Commodity Credit Corporation may sell the wool purchased in previous years and now on hand. It is estimated there are about 460,000,000 pounds of this wool. Up to now this wool could not be sold in competition with foreign wool for the reason that the Commodity Credit Corporation was not permitted to sell below the parity price. Since this price was above the prices quoted on foreign wool there was no opportunity to dispose of the same. This bill removes all restrictions, and this wool can now be sold.

If the bill previously passed by the Congress had become a law this wool could have been sold without any loss to the Government. That bill provided for quotas and import fees on foreign wool in the discretion of the President. In that manner we could have sold this large stock pile of wool and sustained no loss. This bill contains no such provision. I hope we can dispose of this wool with little loss, but we could have avoided any loss whatever if the President had signed the bill passed by this House 2 months ago.

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHENOWETH. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. HAND. I take this opportunity to go on record at this point as being utterly opposed to this legislation or legislation of a similar character.

Mr. CHENOWETH. May I say to my good friend from New Jersey that the time is here when we must pay a little more attention to some of our domestic industries in this country. Otherwise, we will become entirely dependent upon foreign nations for our supply of strategic raw materials, whether it be wool or some other commodity. Surely we learned the value of domestic industries during the war when foreign imports of many items were stopped.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHENOWETH. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. May I say apropos of the remarks of the gentleman from New Jersey that if the wool industry does not get this help he might as well kiss the American wool industry good-bye.

Mr. CHENOWETH. The gentleman is absolutely correct.

Mr. Speaker, I am for this bill. It has passed the Senate and I hope it will be passed by the House without amendment so that it can be sent direct to the White House. I urge the adoption of the rule and the passage of the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

(Mr. CHENOWETH asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

[Mr. SABATH addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

(Mr. SABATH asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL].

(Mr. DINGELL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, when the iniquitous loyalty bill was rigged for passage by the superpatriots and witch hunters of the House who are not satisfied with the thoroughness of the regulations promulgated by Executive order to root out disloyal Communists and parlor pinks, I shuddered at the thought of the humiliation of the countless thousands of faithful and devoted Government employees, loyal to their job and more so to their beloved country, who will be forced to third-degree examinations in order to retain their jobs. The distinguished, able, and trustworthy columnist, Lowell Mellett, known for fairness, liberality, and searching scrutiny, treats the recent and unwarranted action of the House so comprehensively and honestly that I felt I could do no better than to avail myself of his eloquence by inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD his comments published in the Washington Star of Tuesday, July 22. His opinion and expressions coincide with my views and sentiments.

ON THE OTHER HAND—CONGRESS MAY DO THE UNFORGIVABLE IN SEEKING TO ENFORCE LOYALTY BY LAW

(By Lowell Mellett)

In an attempt to do the impossible, Congress may do the unforgivable. The House already has done its worst—but lack of time is likely to prevent the Senate from following suit immediately.

The House seeks to enforce loyalty by law. The Members who voted to do this will tell you this is not quite true, that all they seek to do is to make sure that no disloyal persons shall have employment in the Government.

To this end all persons about to be employed, as well as the hundreds of thousands already employed, would be given searching examinations as to their loyalty. The business would start with the Civil Service Commission looking over its own files and fingerprints and then proceeding to the records of the FBI, the Army and Navy, the House Committee on Un-American Activities, local law enforcement agencies and any other sources that might occur to anybody.

If somewhere along the line something "derogatory" should be turned up—such as somebody making serious but unsupported charges against the man or woman under consideration—the name would be certified to the FBI for a full-fledged investigation. The result of this investigation would be presented to a Federal Loyalty Board, created by the act. This board would decide whether the employee or candidate for a job was loyal. If not found loyal, he would be fired or not hired.

DEFENSE HOBBOLED

The Board would make its decision on evidence—but the accused person would not see or hear the evidence. He could have counsel, but the counsel could not confront his accusers, subpoena witnesses or cross-examine any witness.

The man or woman found guilty of "disloyalty" through this utterly unfair and un-American process would be branded for life. He would find it difficult, if not impossible, to obtain other employment. The man or woman found "loyal" would, in many instances, be in no better situation. The very fact that he or she had been subjected to suspicion and dragged through such proceedings would leave its stigma, a smear that would stick.

That is the unforgivable thing the House is willing to do. And, as said, it is also attempting the impossible.

Loyalty is a state of mind and heart. It is a matter of the spirit. The same is true of disloyalty. Overt disloyalty or treason is a crime and punishable as such. Like every other country, we have plenty of law for that. But only the Japanese, in the heyday of their military men, could conceive of "thought police" as a means of reaching the impure mind. Only the Japanese—until the present strange hysteria hit the House.

It is to be hoped that this hysteria will subside before Congress comes back in January. If it doesn't get better, it may get worse. We may find Federal employees compelled to take new and fearsome oaths, written in their own blood, as a requisite for serving Uncle Sam.

TO HARM INNOCENT

Yet, loyalty will remain a matter of spirit, with no man able to say who does and who does not possess it. You may feel that any man who volunteered in the last war and offered his life in defense of his country had loyalty beyond questioning. But it won't be beyond questioning if he applies for a Government job.

You may have other odd ideas about loyalty. You may think the Members of the House owe a certain amount of loyalty to these same veterans—owe them some loyal assistance or protection in the matter of housing, for example. Many Members, however, including some who voted for this loyalty bill, have a different notion on that subject. Their loyalty has gone instead to the real estate interests.

Loyalty is, indeed, a thing difficult to get at. The House is attempting to get at it in the worst possible way. And, in the process, it is certain to do grievous harm to many innocent persons.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HERTER].

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, there are several things that have happened since this matter was debated by the House some months ago. In the first place the previous bill that passed the House was vetoed by the President. In the second place, the market for wool and particularly fine wool, has strengthened very materially, so that the sales of the finer wools in this country that have been made during the period of the past few months have averaged in price from 5 to 9 cents above the support price provided for in this bill. The poorer grade wool however, is not moving effectively, largely for the reason that the mills have not known whether or not under some such legislation as this the Commodity Credit Corporation will be disposing of its surplus stocks of inferior grade wools at a price which would very much affect the general market.

I realize that the hour is very late, and I am only taking this very brief time now to put into the RECORD an amendment which I shall offer to this bill when it comes up for amendment, which I understand will not be tonight but to-

morrow. That amendment is a very simple one. Instead of fixing the support price at a definite figure which could not change regardless of what happens to other commodities or to our economy in general, I am going to move that the words "at the price it supported wool in 1946" be stricken out and that in lieu thereof there be substituted "at a price not less than 90 percent of parity."

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HERTER. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. Is that not the same language that the gentleman offered when the original wool bill was before the House?

Mr. HERTER. No; it is not the same amendment.

Mr. COOLEY. What is the difference?

Mr. HERTER. The amendment I offered before was at 90 percent of parity. It could not have been fixed higher than that. I am offering tomorrow "at not less than 90 percent of parity" so that the Secretary of Agriculture and the Commodity Credit Corporation can fix it at a higher price if they see fit. That is the formula that has applied to agricultural products. The gentleman's own Committee on Agriculture reported a bill this week dealing with milk prices in which exactly the same formula applies, and it still allows the Commodity Credit Corporation to fix the price higher than 90 percent of parity if it thinks such a price is justified. It is like the Steagall amendment. It is exactly like every other commodity.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY].

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call attention to the fact that back on March 11, 1946, President Truman addressed a letter to Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY in regard to the wool situation, and I would like to read that letter, if I may:

DEAR SENATOR O'MAHONEY: On January 5, 1946, you sent me a memorandum on wool in accordance with a suggestion I had made to you at a conference on the subject. In your memorandum you suggested that I request the interested agencies of the Government to confer and to prepare a wool program. Such a program has now been prepared and is attached. It represents the considered views of the administration on the best methods for solving a serious and difficult problem.

Your committee will, of course, be able to call on the interested agencies for any desired assistance in your further studies of the wool situation or in drafting appropriate legislation.

I trust that the Congress will find that this proposed wool program constitutes a sound and adequate basis for constructive legislation.

In closing I wish to express my agreement with you that cooperation between the Executive and the Congress is essential to the establishment of an effective wool program.

Sincerely yours,

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

In the attached statement the administration and the agencies' interest recognize the fact that parity on wool is not

fair and this is the language pertinent to parity as it affects wool.

1. The parity price of wool be revised or established at the so-called comparable level so that wool parity prices will be on a level equivalent to parity prices for other farm products.

In other words, for some reason the administration and the agencies affected consider 90 percent of parity for wool producers as inadequate protection to the wool growers of the country.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. GRANGER. Of course, if we had adopted the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts, we would never have had this controversy at all. What the gentleman says is the meat of the whole controversy.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH].

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, this is mighty poor legislation. It is nothing but a subsidy bill. It also puts the Government into business to buy all the wool in the country from now on until December 31, 1948. It pays the highest price for wool that we paid in 27 years, and guarantees it with money we will have to take out of the Treasury. We now have 400,000,000 pounds of wool in the stock pile, and the Commodity Credit Corporation is supposed to sell it.

They have to sell it before December 31, 1948 and take any loss that might come to the Treasury. If you are going to pass legislation like this it seems to me we are on the wrong track. Another thing, it gives permission for the President and the State Department to reduce the tariff which is now on scoured wools of 34 cents a pound. If the farmers of this country cannot get along on the price they have now, what are they going to do when you reduce the tariff? It is poor legislation. You ought not to vote for it at all.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I thought I heard the gentleman mention something something about the tariff. How does the gentleman feel about reducing the tariff on woolen textiles?

Mr. RICH. I do not want to reduce it on anything. If you reduce the tariff on any commodity in this country, whereby you wreck the woolen manufacturers, the farmers, the sheep growers, and the labor of this country, I am against it. I have always been against it and I always will be against it. The Republican Party has always been for a high tariff, and it has made this country the greatest country on earth. Do you think I am going to stand for something of that kind? Not on your tintype. I am not built that way.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES].

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order and to revise and extend my remarks and include a table.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, possible abuses of retirement privileges by officer personnel are bringing serious criticisms upon the War and Navy Departments of our Government. In the War Department in the period May 1, 1945, to December 31, 1946, I find that 1,283 Regular Army officers were retired for physical disability. For all other reasons only 408 were retired during this period. That means three out of four were found physically disabled by examining boards.

In the Navy, during the period May 1, 1945, to May 1, 1947, I am advised that 2,864 were retired for physical disability, and only 732 for all other reasons. Here the ratio of retirements for physical disability is nearly 4 to 1.

Since these appear to be disturbing figures, I have secured from official Government sources figures for comparison on the number of physically disabled persons in civilian life. Having noted that the greater number of retirements for physical disability are in the grades of general officer or colonel in the Army, and that a large number of Navy physical disability retirements are in proportionate grades, I assume that we may safely consider only ages 35 to 64.

And here is what we find in civilian life: Two percent of the males in ages 35 to 44 are physically disabled, 3.7 percent of those in ages 45 to 54, 6.4 percent in ages 55 to 59, and 12.1 percent in ages 60 to 64. Yet in the services the percentages of those retired for physical disability runs 75 percent or more among the men retired in the comparable colonel-general age brackets. And the fact has been brought out that many high-ranking officers who retired from the services as physically disabled went immediately into industry at very lucrative salaries.

Now what can be the reason for this condition? How has the percentage of physically disabled reached such alarming heights among officer personnel? Who makes up the retiring boards, and on what basis do they judge physical-disability standards?

It is true that personnel retired for physical disabilities draw in some instances higher retirement pay than they would draw for length of service retirement. And it is true that physical disability retirement pay is not subject to income tax. It is likewise true that retirement pay for length of service is in only a very few cases higher than disability retirement pay. But these should not be deciding factors.

I make no accusations at this time. I simply call attention to the facts, for I find them disturbing. I think this matter should receive serious thought from the membership of the Congress during the period prior to our reconvening in January. A request has been made by the House Committee on Armed Services, partly at my suggestion, that the services

provide us with full and accurate information on this subject during that period, and that careful attention be given to correcting abuses if abuses exist.

In the belief that it may prove interesting, I file herein a table of retirements by officers of the Regular Army. I regret that I have not been furnished a similar table for naval officer personnel.

Retirements of Regular Army commissioned officers, May 1, 1945, to Dec. 31, 1946

Grade	Physical disability	Other retirements (age or service)	Wholly retired ¹	Total
General of the Army.....	1			1
General.....		1		1
Lieutenant general.....	8	3		11
Major general.....	136	28		164
Brigadier general.....	160	47		207
Colonel.....	831	287		1,118
Lieutenant colonel.....	91	38	1	130
Major.....	31	3	1	35
Captain.....	16	1		17
First lieutenant.....	9			9
Second lieutenant.....			1	1
Total.....	1,283	408	3	1,691

¹ Do not receive retired pay.

On Jan 1, 1947, 5,701 commissioned officers of the Regular Army received retired pay.

NOTE.—Non-Regular officers are not placed on the Regular Army retired list. They are certified to the Veterans' Administration for retirement. From Dec. 31, 1941 through Dec. 28, 1946, 26,056 were so certified. May 7, 1945, through Jan. 3, 1947, 18,525 were so certified.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. Has the gentleman obtained similar information with regard to the retirement for disability of Reserve officers, in comparison with retirement for disability of Regular officers?

Mr. SIKES. I do have some information on that but I do not have as complete information on it as I do for the Regular officers. I find that the percentage of Reserve officers who have been retired for physical disability is very small in comparison with the over-all number, and that of the number of Reserve officers who are retired by examining boards, only about one-third are retired for physical disability, whereas nearly all the Regular Army officers who go before the examining board are retired for that reason.

Mr. COOLEY. Is not that a rather strange situation?

Mr. SIKES. I find it so.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BUCK].

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I am speaking with regard to the wool bill. Hold your hats, taxpayers, you are about to be taken for another ride.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 1498) to provide support for wool, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill S. 1498, with Mr. JENKINS of Ohio in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 7 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this bill has been thoroughly discussed on previous occasions, and I am not going to take very much time at this late hour of the day for a general discussion of the subject.

X I am taking these few minutes to call attention to the fact that the bill which is now before us is identical with the bill which passed both Houses and was vetoed by the President except for the fact that section 4 which provided for the imposition of import fees and quotas under the provisions of section 32 of the AAA Act has been eliminated.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I am glad to yield to my colleague.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The gentleman referred to section 4 which was stricken out of the bill. Is it not a fact that the authority conferred under section 4 was a discretionary power in the hands of the President as to whether or not he wanted to impose import fees or a quota?

Mr. HOPE. Yes; it was the same provision which has been applicable at one time or another to something like 40 different agricultural commodities. It vested in the President power and authority to make investigations and determine whether or not support-price programs on agricultural commodities were being interfered with by reason of imports. The provision as to wool simply put it on the same basis as other agricultural commodities which come under the provision of section 22.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. A good many of the newspapers and editorial writers have said that legislation provided for an increase in the duty on wool, and I would like to have the gentleman make it plain that it did no such thing and there was no increase authorized in the duty on wool in that bill.

Mr. HOPE. I am glad the gentleman asked that question because he is absolutely right in his statement that the bill in itself did not provide for any increase in duties. I might say that in all the time that I have been a Member of Congress I cannot recall any bill which was so persistently misrepresented in the press, especially in editorial columns, as the wool bill which passed the House and was vetoed by the President. I am not blaming the press so much for that misrepresentation as I blame the State Department for passing out information which constituted misrepresentation as to the character and purpose of the legislation. But I do not want to spend any more time going into that particular phase of the matter.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. The bill reported by the House certainly authorized the President to increase the tariff to the extent of 50 percent, did it not?

Mr. HOPE. It gave the President the authority that he now has as to a number of other commodities, to either impose a quota or an import fee which would be in effect an increase in the tariff under certain conditions, if certain findings were made and he decided to use his discretion and found it was necessary to do that in order to prevent the support-price program from being interfered with.

Mr. COOLEY. My recollection is that my distinguished colleague very studiously refrained from confessing that the President was ever to exercise his discretion in that certain situation to which the gentleman has referred. Some of the Members said it was a discretionary matter with the President. I took the position at that time, and I still think I was correct in saying that it was not discretionary with the President if the findings justified and indicated the necessity for an increased duty.

Mr. HOPE. Of course, it was necessary for the President to make a determination based upon the findings of fact. That determination was based upon whether or not he concluded that the imports were interfering with the support-price program. That was a matter that necessarily must have been left to his discretion.

Mr. COOLEY. That is right, and that is the only discretion he had to exercise. Now, after having asked the Tariff Commission to make an investigation and then report back to him, if they indicated that the imports were interfering with the domestic program he had no alternative other than to impose it at that time.

Mr. HOPE. No. It was still up to the President, in the exercise of his discretion and judgment, to determine whether or not, based upon the information furnished by the Tariff Commission, imports were interfering with the support-price program.

Mr. COOLEY. But he had to make his determination based upon the findings of fact, and if the findings of fact indicated no other alternative, he had to make it?

Mr. HOPE. Yes, but he had to make the determination. It was not automatic.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. In the first place, it was discretionary on the part of the President to ask the Tariff Commission to make the investigation.

Mr. COOLEY. I agree that is the only discretion he had.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Afterward he had to concur in the findings of the Tariff Commission, and if he did not find that the facts submitted by the Tariff Commission were in accordance with his views, it was discretionary with him whether or not he wanted to exercise his power.

Mr. COOLEY. It would not have been a question of being in accord with his views, but in accord with the facts.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] has expired.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself five additional minutes.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from Wyoming.

Mr. BARRETT. It seems to me also that under section 4 the President could only impose such fees as would bring the price of foreign wool up to the price wool is supported under the wool program. Is that not true?

Mr. HOPE. Yes; that is correct.

Now, I do not want to get into any further discussion of the provisions of the other bill, because that is water over the dam. The President vetoed the bill. The Congress did not override the veto. While I think the other method of approaching the problem was preferable, we were not successful in solving it that way, and we are now coming here with what I think is the second best way of affording a price-support program for wool.

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield.

Mr. HERTER. I am wondering whether the gentleman can advise me whether he would accept an amendment. Instead of 90 percent of parity it could be fixed at a higher price, if the Secretary of Agriculture or the Commodity Credit Corporation so desired.

Mr. HOPE. No. I do not believe I would be in a position to accept that amendment.

It has already been brought to the attention of the committee that the parity price on wool does not at this time reflect a fair relationship as between wool and other farm commodities or a fair relationship with the cost of production, and for that reason among others, I do not believe that I could consistently agree to the amendment suggested.

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a further question?

Mr. HOPE. I yield.

Mr. HERTER. Is it not true that the Commodity Credit Corporation today is supporting certain commodities at higher than 90 percent of parity? For instance, cotton is being supported at 92½ percent and some commodities at a higher price because of the necessity of stimulating production. Would not the gentleman be willing to look to the same people who have discretion in all Steagall commodities to determine what is the proper price above 90 percent of parity to make the same determination in the case of wool?

Mr. HOPE. The support price of wool which we are asking in this bill is the same support price that has prevailed since 1943. Practically all other prices are now far higher than they were in 1943. I do not believe that it is out of the way to urge that the 1943 price should be continued. I realize that the gentleman's amendment does not necessarily reduce the rate at which the price would be supported, but it would give authority to support the price at a lower rate, which I do not believe would be desirable at this time.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. The only thing "comparable price" means is that wool would then be given the same treatment that other agricultural commodities enjoy under the parity formula of the Steagall amendment.

Mr. HOPE. Yes; as a matter of fact we are not stabilizing the price of wool at the comparable price. There are some other commodities in the same situation as wool where the Department of Agriculture has determined a comparable price and use that for stabilization purposes. But that is not true of wool. If that provision were in the bill it would result in a price 4 or 5 cents higher than the price now contained in the bill.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. That is right.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield.

Mr. JENNINGS. The bill now before use is the Senate bill and has passed the Senate.

Mr. HOPE. That is correct.

Mr. JENNINGS. Should it be amended it would then go to conference and in this jam we are in there would be very little probability of its becoming law at all.

Mr. HOPE. The gentleman has raised a very good point and one to which we must give consideration in this late stage of the session, because unless the bill can be passed in its present form it certainly is very doubtful as to whether it can become law at this session.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself three additional minutes.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield.

Mr. GRANGER. The gentleman will remember, of course, that the original O'Mahoney bill regarding which the gentleman from North Carolina read a letter from the President to Senator O'MAHONEY, contains the very thing we are talking about here, a comparable price. We were trying to change the formula that put wool on a parity with other commodities. Is not that true?

Mr. HOPE. That is correct.

Mr. GRANGER. And as to the comparable price some of the members of our committee did not want to go along with it. This is the compromise. This is the only thing that has ever been found which would meet the issue. We might just as well not pass this bill if we accept the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts because that is the reason the bill was introduced in the first place.

Mr. HOPE. Yes; I agree with the gentleman. I appreciate the contribution he has made by calling attention to that fact.

Just briefly in conclusion I wish to bring the attention of the committee to the fact that the situation has changed somewhat as to wool prices in recent weeks.

There has been a stiffening of the price as far as the better grades are concerned,

as stated by the gentleman from Massachusetts. That is fortunate in that those grades have been selling higher than the support price would have been and there has been that much more wool on the open market. We want all of the wool to go to the market place that can possibly go there. The Commodity Credit Corporation has been able to sell some of its stocks of wool because the better grades have gone above the parity price. That is all to the good, and we are glad that is the situation because it means that in the end this operation is not going to be as costly to the Government as it would be otherwise. It means that the loss of the Commodity Credit Corporation is going to be less but it does not in any way lessen the need for this legislation because we do not know what the market may be or where it may go between now and December 31, 1948, at which time this program will end. The Army, so I am told, wants to take some of the stock pile of the Commodity Credit Corporation and, of course, that will help in the liquidation and will cut down the loss that will be sustained on account of this liquidation. So I think those who have been fearful of the cost that might accrue under this legislation can vote for this bill with the assurance that a change in conditions has reduced the probable cost considerably.

I hope that the committee will approve the bill without amendment and that we can send it to the President in the form in which it was passed by the Senate.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may desire.

Mr. Chairman, this whole matter has been debated on the floor formerly and I think every Member is acquainted with the provisions of the present bill. It has been passed by the Senate. There is no question in the world, in the event we give favorable consideration to the bill, but what the President will approve the legislation. It is absolutely necessary to protect the wool industry in America. There is no other way around. I do not think the membership of this House wants to put the great wool industry out of business.

Mr. Chairman, if we do not get this legislation we are not going to get any legislation at all. It is up to us to make that determination here and now. The committee is in possession of all the facts in connection with the whole situation, therefore I do not see any necessity for prolonging the discussion. We are only attempting to give the wool grower the same treatment that the producers of other agricultural commodities received under what is known as the Steagall amendment, a fair price. A parity price to the wool growers under the parity formula is not a fair price. That is the reason this legislation changes the parity formula with respect to wool. It is just simply doing justice to the wool growers of America.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. I favor this measure and I favor it for the benefit of the wool

growers of the entire Nation and particularly of my own State. Its enactment will be in simple justice to them. But there is another group dependent upon us in this matter of the price of wool.

I would like to say this, in addition to the white men there are in my State about 60,000 Navajo Indians and others who are nomadic, living upon their sheep, and the price of wool means everything in their economy. They are hard pressed now and up against the limit of subsistence. So, I am thinking in behalf of the 60,000 Navajo and Hopi Indians who produce wool and depend upon it for their very living. It is even better to give them a fair price than to furnish them charity. They prefer it rather than charity.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. Some of the statements which have been made during the debate on this matter might indicate or tend to indicate that this support program was not needed. As the gentleman has pointed out, we are faced with a situation that we either take this bill or no bill at all. Now, if we have no bill at all, its natural result might be that the market for wool at present levels might go to pieces.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. And I think it would go to pieces.

Mr. COOLEY. Because we have a tremendous surplus hanging over the market at the present time.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. And I think it will take this legislation to give the wool growers of America reasonable protection.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS].

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, your Committee on Veterans' Affairs has worked diligently and I want to report to the House that the Committee on Veterans' Affairs has reported five bills we believe should pass, the President and his Budget Bureau notwithstanding. But to date the veterans' legislation Congress has passed has amounted to very little, because the insurance-time-extension bill simply gives the veterans a chance to apply for insurance. It is a commercial matter. The veterans pay for it. It should not be called a benefit, in fact. The House has one very important bill—the Patterson bill—which would give service presumption to chronic and tropical diseases.

This bill has passed the other body. I want to bring to the attention of the House again that if we do not pass the Senate bill which is now on the Speaker's desk, which gives the blind, the double arm amputees, and the double leg amputees automobiles, we are de-

priving the men, the most seriously wounded, of transportation that they can use in securing jobs. There are only 12,000 affected. They are the last ones of the group that are always classed together for rating purposes. The cost would not be great and would cover a period of 3 years. I know no Member wants to go back to his district and face a blind boy, when a boy with a leg off or a boy with both legs off can get an automobile, and say, "You cannot. The Congress did not choose to give you a car; it was not willing to do it." The bill was discriminatory last year. This rectifies that.

We passed other legislation out of our committee, Mr. Speaker, that is vitally needed. I do not know how the Members can go back and I do not know how I can go back and tell the veterans of various organizations where I have been asked to speak in the hospitals and say, "No, the Congress has passed millions and millions of dollars for relief to foreign countries and never counted the cost, but we are not passing legislation for the veterans because of the cost."

The Congress cashed the terminal-leave-pay bonds for the able-bodied, but did nothing additional for the disabled.

Mr. Speaker, there is other much-needed legislation already passed by the other body which is on the Speaker's desk, legislation which your committee on veterans' legislation passed first but which has not been acted upon by the House. The other body passed the on-the-job training bill, the subsistence-allowance bill, the bill for increased allowances for disabled taking vocational training, the amputee-car bill and the institutional farm-training bill which the House already has passed.

I believe the leadership will bring up those bills for action tomorrow. I still have faith. I do not believe that faith will be betrayed.

Six months, when the House will reconvene, will be too late for the men and women in school and in training.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL].

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, and I am not going to object to this request, but I want to serve notice at this time that I shall object to any other requests to speak out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the statement made by the very able gentlewoman from Massachusetts. I am in full accord with her that there has not been very important legislation concerning veterans passed by this body, and we would be sorely remiss in our duties to the veterans if we did not fully enact legislation that has been recently passed by the Senate.

Yesterday afternoon I called the attention of this body to a bill, S. 1394,

which was passed by the Senate unanimously and now is languishing in a committee in this body. I was much surprised today when the majority leader issued his statement to this body in which he quoted from the President's speech of last January 6. The majority leader said:

That statement can leave no question about the opposition of President Truman to additional veterans' legislation of any consequence.

I say that is not true. The President has yet to veto any bill concerning veterans' legislation which has been passed by this Congress. I am confident that he will not veto the type of veterans' legislation having senatorial approval. If the legislation the gentlewoman from Massachusetts has spoken to you about, including S. 1394, passes this body there will be no Presidential veto. Of that I am confident. If we adopt and approve these bills which the Senate has passed unanimously, there will be no Presidential veto.

Let me tell you what I suspect is the real motive behind the majority leader's remarks. For some unknown reason the Republican leadership of this body is attempting to avoid the consequences of bottling up veterans' legislation. It is common knowledge that they will not permit S. 1394 and other measures recently passed by the Senate to come before this body for action. Now there is great demand for this legislation. Disabled war veterans need the assistance provided by some of these bills, and particularly in S. 1394 thousands upon thousands of veterans have been pressing for an increase in their subsistence allowance in order to meet the continued rise in the cost of living.

The majority leader, in the prepared speech before this body today, has expressed deep concern over the possibility of a Presidential veto of additional veterans' legislation. I cannot understand, at this late date, his solicitude about a Presidential veto. Certainly such concern was not manifest with regard to other important measures which have been passed through this body under the guiding hand of the Republican leadership. I refer now to the Taft-Hartley bill and to the tax bills. I suggest to the majority leader that the proper way to place the onus on the executive branch of the Government is to give it an opportunity to perform its function. Bring these important veteran bills before this Congress. Let us perform our legislative function under the Constitution and then let the record clearly show whether or not the President will veto these extremely important measures. The responsibility for the passage of these measures is directly that of the majority party and its leadership. No searching and grasping from disconnected portions of the President's speech of last January can relieve the majority leadership of this body from its responsibility.

Again, I agree with the gentlewoman from Massachusetts that this is a part of the unfinished business of this Congress and in good conscience we cannot face our veterans at home unless we act now.

(Mr. CARROLL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) the Commodity Credit Corporation shall continue, until December 31, 1948, to support a price to producers of wool in the continental United States and Territories at the price it supported wool in 1946.

(b) Notwithstanding any other provisions hereof, the Commodity Credit Corporation may adjust support prices for individual grades and qualities of wool for the purpose of bringing about a fair and equitable relationship in the support prices for the various grades and qualities of wool; and may make discounts from support prices for off-quality, inferior-grade, or poorly prepared wool.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. JENKINS of Ohio, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (S. 1498) to provide support for wool, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HILL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include an editorial.

Mr. DORN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include an address by Governor Thurmond, of South Carolina, at the governors' conference in Salt Lake City.

Mr. SADLAK asked and was given permission for himself and Mr. FOOTE to extend their remarks in the Record immediately following the passage of House Joint Resolution 246.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri (at the request of Mr. ARENDS) was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record.

Mr. JAVITS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record just before the vote on Senate Joint Resolution 138.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the Record immediately following the passage of the bill H. R. 3215, and also to extend her remarks in the Appendix of the Record and include two letters.

Mr. FLETCHER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. WEICHEL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record in two instances.

Mr. SADOWSKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record in two instances.

HOOR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 10 o'clock tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, following any special order heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. TEAGUE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

CONTESTED-ELECTION CASE—LAWRENCE MICHAEL AGAINST HOWARD W. SMITH

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House, which was read and, with accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on House Administration and ordered to be printed:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., July 25, 1947.

The honorable the SPEAKER,

House of Representatives.

SIR: The motion to dismiss of the contestee in the contested-election case of Lawrence Michael against HOWARD W. SMITH for a seat in the House of Representatives from the Eighth Congressional District of the State of Virginia, filed in this office July 25, 1947, is transmitted herewith for reference to the appropriate committee.

Yours respectfully,

JOHN ANDREWS,

Clerk of the House of Representatives.

AMENDING NATIONAL HOUSING ACT

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency may have until midnight tonight to file a report on H. R. 4395 to amend the National Housing Act to increase insurance on FHA title VI loans.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUCHANAN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

NO. 1 FAILURE OF THE EIGHTIETH CONGRESS—SUBSERVIENCE TO THE REAL-ESTATE LOBBY

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, in March of 1946 the Chicago Daily News printed a dispatch from Washington which gladdened the hearts of the members of one of the most powerful lobbies operating at present in this country. The headline said, "How lobby helped weaken housing bill."

The story read in part:

The housing bill passed the House this week with the guts cut out of it—and it was a luncheon club that did the gutting.

Sitting around a luncheon table, Washington secretaries of construction trade associations decided they didn't like the idea of price ceilings on old houses or subsidies to stimulate building-material production.

So they went to work, and soon every Member of the House was getting telegrams from lumber dealers, contractors, real-estate firms, builders, and architects in his district.

Then the story quotes Herbert U. Nelson, executive vice president of the National Association of Real Estate Boards, as follows:

"We've got a gang in power who think solely of the consumer and usually in terms of 'protecting' him," said Nelson.

He was referring to the Democratic administration, which was launching an aggressive emergency housing program in the early months of 1946.

From the warped viewpoint of the real-estate lobby, protecting the consumer is a bad thing. They schemed cleverly to end this protection, but could not overcome the Democratic administration backed up by the Democratic Congress.

That was in 1946, prior to November 6.

Sure the Democratic Party wants to protect the consumer, and we were proud of it.

But the Republican Party came into control of Congress in the fluke elections of '46 and then the real-estate lobby has literally "gone to town."

Six weeks before the session opened the president of the National Association of Real Estate Boards told members to wait for the new Congress on the Capitol steps with a proposal for a cushioned decontrol of rents.

Cushioned decontrol of rents is a nice way of saying "Let us get rid of the protection that keeps the consumer from being at the mercy of greedy landlords."

Under the pretext of extending rent control, a bill was finally passed which I termed "a monstrosity." This was in committee when I first saw this strange creature known as the Housing and Rent Act of 1947—H. R. 3203.

Actually, this bill killed the existing emergency program to get housing for veterans. It was supposed to remove all the restrictions on commercial building. Restrictions that had been put in to give builders of living places for veterans a chance to compete against money-heavy commercial and industrial builders for scarce building materials.

The real-estate profiteers and speculators are doing very well under the existing housing shortage, and profits are much higher in commercial construction than in home building, so big business did not like the provisions that held it back to let home building go ahead faster.

The real-estate lobby cracked its whip and the Republican majority in Congress jumped through the hoop.

The result: Congress enacted a hodgepodge and a monstrosity known as the Housing and Rent Control Act of 1947.

Of course, the nastiest thing about this bill was the cruel joker provision which gave landlords the right to extract a 15-percent rent increase from helpless tenants. It gave tenants the choice of going for the 15-percent jump now or really getting blackjacked later on. In effect, it has been misnamed a "voluntary agreement."

Many helpless tenants really know what it means by now.

This bill was delayed in the other body until late in the session and then sent to

the White House as part of a carefully laid political scheme.

If the President did not sign this phony bill, which gives a little protection to the consumer, the Republicans said brazenly they would pass no rent control law.

So the question was whether it was better to protect the consumer at least to the extent of some curb on landlords' greed or whether to have no law and put all tenants completely at the mercy of property owners at once.

Of course, neither choice was a good one. But the President decided wisely that a little protection for the consumer was better than none, so he signed the bill after issuing a blistering statement castigating the real-estate lobby and pointing out the evils of this bill.

I said this was part of a well-planned political scheme. It was. The Republicans deliberately held off the choice of a bad bill or no rent control bill at all until too late in the session for a better law to be pushed through before the old one expired.

Like the wolf in Little Red Riding Hood, the real-estate lobby said that nobody needed to be afraid of them because landlords wouldn't take unfair advantage of the privileges they were given under this bill.

Well, hotel rooms rented on a monthly basis were freed from rent control under this bill. Hotel operators around the country promptly dropped the mask of being grandma and stood revealed as the ravenous wolf.

Rates were increased as high as 200 percent. Even flophouse rates soared upward in an inflationary spiral. It was plain that the same thing would have happened to other tenants without the meager protection they receive under this bill.

This breaking of its promise is typical of the performance of the real-estate lobby.

Last year the real-estate lobby said in canned news releases that elimination of price controls would speed construction of homes and lower the cost of homes.

So price controls were removed. Prices of homes soared skyward. The veteran making \$40 or \$50 a week had a fine selection of homes—jerry built cracker-boxes—that he could buy for from eight, or nine, or ten thousand dollars.

That was the lower costs, that the real estate lobby promised. But the real estate lobby is not much interested in the people who do not have seven or eight thousand dollars lying around in loose cash.

The real estate lobby's promise to solve the housing problem if government controls were removed stands today as a cruel mockery to the homeless veteran—as cruel as its repeated statements that there is no housing shortage.

Yes, the real estate lobby actually makes that argument. They say there is no housing shortage. They say it is just overconsumption of existing space. Look what we are doing now? Have you seen the figures for June 1947?

The real estate lobby has a simple solution to this so-called overconsumption

53. PEANUT QUOTAS. Passed without amendment H. R. 4124, to make various changes in the peanut-quota provisions under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 (p. 10464). This bill will now be sent to the President.
54. RESEARCH, MARKETING. Passed without amendment H. R. 4110, regarding distribution of appropriations, rather than authorizations, under the Research and Marketing Act of 1946 (p. 10464). This bill will now be sent to the President.
55. AGRICULTURAL STUDIES. Agreed, as reported, to S. Res. 147, to authorize the Agriculture and Forestry Committee to investigate needs, trends, etc., of agriculture (pp. 10479-80).
56. REMOUNT SERVICE. Sen. Morse, Oreg., inserted a statement favoring H. R. 3484, to transfer the Remount Service to the Agriculture Department, and said he would support its passage at the next session (pp. 10635-7).
57. FCA AUDIT. Received the GAO audit report on FCA corporations; to Expenditures in the Executive Departments Committee (p. 10456).
58. TRANSPORTATION. Sen. Reed, Kans., discussed "the cotton belt case" regarding transportation and said this was "unequal justice under law" (pp. 10511-13).
59. MISSOURI VALLEY AUTHORITY. Sen. Revercomb, W. Va., reviewed the accomplishments to date in carrying out the objectives of S. 1156, to establish an MVA (pp. 10519-20).
- Both Houses
60. PRICE INVESTIGATION. /agreed, without amendment, to S. Con. Res. 19, to provide for an investigation of the reasons for high prices by the Joint Committee on the Economic Report (pp. 10468-9, 10476-7, 10560).
61. MINERALS. Passed without amendment H. R. 1602, to continue authority for RFC subsidies on minerals (pp. 10480, 10520-2, 10605-8). This bill will now be sent to the President.
62. SMALL BUSINESS. Agreed, with amendment, to S. Res. 153, to provide \$50,000 additional for investigations by the Small Business Committee (pp. 10461-3). Sen. Fulbright, Ark., inserted a statement regarding the newsprint situation (pp. 10461-3).
63. LATIN AMERICA. Passed without amendment H. R. 4168, to provide for reincorporation of the Institute of Inter-American Affairs (p. 10461). This bill will now be sent to the President.
64. PERSONNEL RETIREMENT. Sens. Langer, N. Dak., and Maybank, S. C., spoke in favor of H. R. 4127, the omnibus civil-service retirement bill (pp. 10467, 10517).
65. FOREIGN INFORMATION. Passed without amendment S. Con. Res. 29, providing for a Joint Committee on Government Information Programs to investigate activities of the State Department and other Government agencies to acquaint peoples of foreign countries with the U. S., its people and their activities, and the policies and objectives of its Government (pp. 10469-70, 10475-6).
66. SURPLUS PROPERTY. Passed as reported S. 1302, to authorize WAA to donate surplus property to organizations for athletic and sports programs (p. 10471).
67. CLAIMS. Passed as reported H. R. 3690, to amend the Federal Tort Claims Act

regarding death statutes and decisions in Ala. and Mass. (p. 10472). The House later concurred in the amendments (pp. 10558-9). This bill will now be sent to the President.

68. RURAL ELECTRIFICATION. Sen. Langer, N. Dak., inserted a "letter to the farmers" criticizing cuts in the REA estimates (p. 10500).

HOUSE - July 26

69. WOOL-PRICE SUPPORTS. Passed without amendment S. 1498, to provide for price supports on wool (pp. 10529-39). This bill will now be sent to the President. Rejected an amendment by Rep. Herter, Mass., to provide for support at 90% of parity rather than the 1946 level (p. 10537). Rejected, 64-128, a motion by Rep. Herter to recommit the bill with instructions to insert this amendment (p. 10539).
70. GARBAGE IMPORTATION. Concurred in the Senate amendments to H. R. 597, to regulate the importation and depositing of garbage (pp. 10581, 10458). This bill will now be sent to the President.
71. FARM TRAINING. Concurred in the Senate amendments to H. R. 2181, to liberalize the farm-training provisions of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act (p. 10551). This bill will now be sent to the President.
72. HOUSING INVESTIGATION. Refused to concur in the Senate amendment to H. Con. Res. 104, providing for a joint investigation of housing (p. 10550). Later the Senate receded from its amendment (p. 10501).
73. AUDITS. Agreed, without amendment, to H. Res. 352, providing for the printing of GAO audit reports as H. documents during recess (p. 10597).
74. WAR DEPARTMENT CIVIL APPROPRIATION BILL. Both Houses agreed to the conference report on H. R. 4002 (pp. 10560-8, 10631-5). This bill will now be sent to the President. During debate on this conference report, Sen. Taylor, Idaho, discussed his previous statements, and statements by the Forest Service, regarding depletion of forest resources (pp. 10634-5).
75. APPROPRIATIONS. Rep. Dirksen, Ill., commended the efforts of Chairman Taber of the Appropriations Committee regarding appropriation matters (p. 10585).
76. AGRICULTURE COMMITTEE. Rep. Gross, Pa., reviewed accomplishments of this Committee (p. 10586).

76a.

ADJOURNMENT, ETC.

Both Houses agreed to adjourn until Jan. 2, 1948, or 3 days after being recalled by the President pro tem of the Senate, the Speaker of the House, and the 2 majority leaders, acting jointly. Both Houses also passed without amendment S. J. Res. 156, to provide that the second regular session of the 80th Congress begin Jan. 6, 1948. (pp. 10599, 10601, 10642-3, 10649.) The Senate was still in session July 27 when the Congressional Record went to press, and its continued proceedings will be included in the next issue of the Record. The Joint Committee on Printing announced that the last issue of the Congressional Record for the first session will be printed not later than Aug. 15, 1947 (p. 10455).

Bills upon which final action was not completed, retain their present status at the beginning of the next session and do not need to be re-introduced.

Mr. SHAFER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement by Robert Hutchinson.

Mr. HOFFMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in five instances and include certain extraneous matter.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD on several subjects.

Mr. JONES of Washington asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution passed by the City Council of Seattle, Wash.

Mr. RILEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD in two instances.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday I received unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD but failed to include in my request that I be permitted to include some extraneous matter. I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to extend my remarks and include that article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

[The matter referred to will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article on the situation in China. I am informed by the Public Printer that this will exceed two pages of the RECORD and will cost approximately \$370, but I ask that it be printed notwithstanding that fact.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, notwithstanding the cost, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

[The matter referred to will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD on the late Robert J. Watt.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

ROBERT J. WATT

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I arise at this time to pay tribute to a man whom I consider one of the most active, most popular and colorful personalities on the American labor scene; a man of unusual ability, sound judgment, a fine citizen, and a great friend.

We learned on yesterday with deepest regret the passing of Robert J. Watt, a noted American labor leader and a former member of our War Labor Board, as he was returning from labor conferences overseas. We remember him as the champion in the labor movement here in the United States, representing us abroad in labor conferences, and for that fact alone, a grateful Nation mourns his passing.

Mr. Watt, an international representative of the American Federation of Labor, was returning with his wife on the liner *Saturnia*, from the International Labor Conferences at Geneva, when the hand of fate reached in and took him from us.

Robert J. Watt, born in Scotland, came to our shores in 1912, and made his home in my city of Lawrence, Mass. Within a few short years he started on his long and successful career as an ardent supporter of labor and legislation beneficial to the laboring class. As a member of the building trades organization, following his occupation as a painter, he was soon elected president of the Lawrence Central Labor Union, of Lawrence, Mass. Within a short period of time due to his close association with the workingman, his sincerity, his ability, and the fact that he was an untiring worker and organizer and student of labor legislation, he was elected secretary-treasurer of the Massachusetts State Federation of Labor. He continued in that capacity and remained with that organization until his appointment as the international representative of the American Federation of Labor in 1936.

Since that time he has been located here in the headquarters in the District of Columbia and has appeared on countless occasions before committees of Congress in the interest of American labor.

He was honored by our late President Franklin Delano Roosevelt on appointment as a member of his Labor Commission to England and Sweden in 1938 and served as delegate to the International Labor Conferences at Paris and Geneva and in that position has represented labor abroad on several occasions.

He was beloved through all of his long and successful career by the humble, hard-working men and women, not only of Massachusetts, but the entire United States. He came up from the people and never lost his touch with them.

The loyalty he inspired is measured by the widespread grief that attends his passing. In the hearts of all the members of the American Federation of Labor and other labor organizations, there is a feeling of sadness and bereavement. As a member of the War Labor Board and the Wage Stabilization Board, and in the deliberation of those bodies, he served with intelligence, with energy, and devotion.

Bobby Watt will live on, cherished in the hearts of those who knew him, and I know that I join with countless Members of this Congress in extending our sincere and deepest sympathy to Mrs. Robert J. Watt, and the members of her immediate family.

ELECTION CONTESTS

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I offer a resolution (H. R. 345) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the election contest of Harold C. Woodward, contestant against THOMAS J. O'BRIEN, contestee, Sixth Congressional District of Illinois, be dismissed, and that

the said THOMAS J. O'BRIEN is entitled to his seat as a Representative of said district and State; and be it further

Resolved, That the election contest of Frederick M. Roberts, contestant, against HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS, contestee, Fourteenth Congressional District of California, be dismissed and that the said HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS is entitled to her seat as a Representative of said district and State; and be it further

Resolved, That the election contest of Lawrence Michael, contestant, against HOWARD W. SMITH, contestee, Eighth Congressional District of the State of Virginia, be dismissed, and that the said HOWARD W. SMITH is entitled to his seat as a Representative of said district and State.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE WOOL BILL

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (S. 1498) to provide support for wool, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill S. 1498, with Mr. JENKINS of Ohio in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose yesterday the first section of the bill had been read.

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HERTER: Beginning on line 5, page 1, strike out the words "at the price it supported wool in 1946" and insert in lieu thereof the words "at a price not less than 90 percent of parity."

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Chairman, this amendment, in effect, places wool in the same category as all the Steagall amendment commodities on which the Government had established support prices. It does not say that the support price must be 90 percent of parity, but it allows the same discretion as is allowed the Secretary of Agriculture and the Commodity Credit Corporation with respect to every other agricultural commodity for which legislation has been passed.

May I point out, Mr. Chairman, that insofar as I know the House has not placed a fixed price during the entire war period or in the postwar period on a single commodity. It has used the parity formula in the case of agricultural commodities. Even in the bill that passed only a few days ago, dealing with certain critical metals, we did not put a fixed price in the bill. We provided for a maximum price and allowed discretion in a special board to put on certain metals and minerals a price up to that maximum. But there was no fixed price set. Here, sir, in this bill we are setting an entirely new precedent from the point of view of the Congress.

We are saying that the Government must put a given fixed price on a commodity and that that fixed price must remain in effect for a period of 2 years, regardless of anything that may happen to our economy. If that precedent is established, I think you will see that in the years to come we are going to have

commodity after commodity coming before us not asking for a price on any given formula in relation to other commodities but asking for a price or figure which the manufacturers or producers of that commodity feel will give to them a fair return and profit. We will then be in the business of price-fixing worse than the OPA.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HERTER. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I would like to point out to the gentleman that the Administration fixed a support-price of \$6 a bushel for flax, which is considerably higher, a dollar or more per bushel, than the formula which the gentleman is proposing.

Mr. HERTER. I quite agree with the gentleman, but that is not what I am talking about. The Administration, under its discretionary power, fixed that price. It was not the Congress that fixed that price. When the Congress begins to fix prices we are doing exactly what we criticized in the OPA, and we are becoming arbiters as to what price will be set. We are not leaving any discretionary power to allow flexibility and we are not setting up criteria.

Mr. HAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HERTER. I yield.

Mr. HAND. If we do not adopt the gentleman's amendment, we will be singling out this one small industry and giving it special benefit.

Mr. HERTER. That is quite true. We will be singling out one particular industry and giving it treatment such as I hope we will never give to any other commodity. It seems to me that when the Congress of the United States, as a board of directors, tries to fix irrevocable prices on commodities, we have bitten off a great deal more than we can chew. We have started a precedent that will be of utmost danger to our future economy.

Finally, may I say this in connection with this amendment: It has been my hope throughout that wool could continue to move in open markets as a free commodity. Today all the better grades are moving and moving rapidly. They are moving at prices considerably above this fixed price. However, the poorer grades, if we do not adopt this fixed price, will begin to move rapidly, and even they may move above this support price. I hope it will be no longer necessary for our Government to remain in the business of purchasing the entire output of a given commodity and selling it at a loss at the taxpayer's expense.

May I say this: There is no question in my mind but what, if this bill is passed, we may see some tariff changes. I am not going to argue the merits or demerits of changes in the tariff, but I do want to point out the economic consequences should the tariff be changed. In this bill we are taking out an unlimited commitment, insofar as the taxpayer is concerned. In the event the Geneva Conference should lower the tariff, it will cost the taxpayer twice the sum that we may expect to be involved. In the first place, we would lose the revenue from the tariff. In the second place, we

would have to make up the difference by a subsidy for our producers in this country.

I hope, Mr. Chairman, that this amendment will be adopted. I realize that the hour is late, but I can assure you I have had no hand in delaying this bill so that it would come to us at the last moment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HERTER] has expired.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment, and I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object in this case, but we have a great many bills affecting the armed services and I shall be compelled to object to anyone else asking to proceed additional time.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah [Mr. GRANGER]?

There was no objection.

(Mr. GRANGER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, of course, if it is the desire of the Congress to kill this bill, I think the way to do it would be to adopt this amendment. We are in the closing days of this session, and very likely the House would adjourn before a conference could be had on this bill.

I want to express my appreciation to the majority leadership for allowing this bill to come before the Congress at this time.

I think they could have said, with some justification, that we have had our day in court and that we could shift for ourselves from here on. I appreciate their allowing the bill to come up, and I am sure many people feel as I do. In all my experience I have never seen a piece of legislation that has been so misrepresented to the American people. I have read editorials and comments on this legislation but have not seen one yet that really told the facts about this legislation.

In my judgment the original legislation we passed that was vetoed was absolutely consistent with our agricultural policy and was not inconsistent with our foreign policy; but that it water over the dam, and we have a practical situation here today.

If we adopt the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts we will kick the props out from under this legislation for which we have been contending from the very beginning. When this legislation was first introduced it was the desire of the wool growers, and I think they had the support of the Committee on Agriculture, to give wool a fair parity with other farm commodities. It is conceded that it does not. The original bill was intended to establish a comparable price for wool and put wool on a parity with other agricultural commodities. If that had been accom-

plished, of course, we would agree with the gentleman from Massachusetts that we were entitled to only 90 percent of parity. That is all the other agricultural commodities now have.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRANGER. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Is it not also true that the wool people were frozen, that they did not enjoy the expanded price that many other agricultural commodities enjoy because the price of wool has been frozen all during this period?

Mr. GRANGER. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. Wool was put under the OPA, and the price we are fixing here is still an OPA price.

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRANGER. I yield.

Mr. HERTER. Is it not a fact that if my amendment were adopted the administrative branch of the Government as represented by the Commodity Credit Corporation through the Secretary of Agriculture would fix the price of wool at exactly the point the gentleman says it ought to be fixed at in comparison with other commodities?

Mr. GRANGER. I think perhaps so, but the Secretary of Agriculture wanted some affirmative legislation on this subject, and this is what we are trying to do for them.

We have had all kinds of arguments that wool was just a byproduct of the sheep industry. As a matter of fact, about 47 percent of the revenue of the sheep industry comes from the production of wool. It is an essential part of the industry and it is essential to have this industry in our country so that we can meet any emergency that can arise.

Let me say to those people who speak of the consumers, that if the day ever comes that we have to depend entirely upon wool and lambs being brought in from afar then we shall have to pay considerably more than we have ever paid under our own local production.

Despite what has been said, this industry is a sick industry. Never in all my experience has it been a prosperous industry. They have had some good years but most of the time they have been just hanging on through bad years. Most of the years have been bad. I hope this Congress is not going to listen to that group of people who are opposed to this legislation who are on the pricing end of it, the people who have made the money out of the industry, and who have consistently opposed this legislation.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRANGER. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Is it not true that the adoption of this particular amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts would in effect kill the bill at this late hour?

Mr. GRANGER. Absolutely; there is no question about it.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRANGER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. Is it not also true that about 30 percent of this industry has already disappeared from the American scene?

Mr. GRANGER. Yes; it has. The sheep industry is lower in number than it has been in the last 50 years.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRANGER. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. JENNINGS. In 1870 the population of this country was 40,000,000. Today it is 142,000,000. There are less sheep in the country today than there were then. I can understand why a man who wants to take wool and put the wool into blankets or cloth is against this proposition because he would get his wool 5 cents cheaper if this bill does not pass. We are all human. But instead of having a dead sheep industry, I want a live one, an American one that will continue to exist.

Mr. GRANGER. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. I may say in that connection also that should this amendment be adopted it could readily have the effect, and I believe it would have the effect, of reducing the price of wool at least 4 or 5 cents a pound. We are dealing now with an industry that cannot stand any more price reduction.

In further reply to what the gentleman from Massachusetts said there may be some discussion of a reduction in the tariff. If we pass this amendment, it would have the opposite effect. To reject the amendment and pass this bill would be a warning to those people who are discussing these things at Geneva that we need some protection and that the Congress of the United States has said so. I hope it will have the effect of discouraging a lowering of the tariff at the present time.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Utah has expired.

(Mr. GRANGER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this opportunity to state to the Members that Mr. W. H. McGinnis, of route 2, Decatur, Ga., has sent a shipment of splendid Georgia peaches for distribution to the membership of the House. I have had them placed in each of the cloakrooms and invite you to help yourselves.

Mr. McGinnis is a World War II veteran; he is the son-in-law of Rev. W. M. Anderson, of De Kalb County, one of our fine farmers and peach growers. May I say on behalf of Mr. McGinnis, the citizens of the Fifth District of Georgia and myself, that we wish for you on this closing day of the session a safe trip home and a pleasant vacation and express the hope that this fine fruit will enable each Congressman to wind up his stay here with a good taste in his mouth.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, Mr. McGinnis sent peaches here so you will have a good bite at lunch time, but if you adopt this wool bill as it is presented to us here

today you will be pulling the wool over the eyes of the American people.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts should be adopted for the reason that all other agricultural commodities have been guaranteed by the Federal Government at 90 percent of parity. This bill as it is presented to us without the pending amendment gives the wool growers of this country the highest price that has been paid for wool in 27 years. It guarantees that price, which is the price that we had last year.

The fact of the matter is, the reason we have a shortage of sheep in this country is because of the high price received for lambs that the farmers have been marketing. The high lamb prices is the reason we do not have the great number of sheep. Understand, I want the farmers and the sheep industry of this country to prosper; nobody would be benefited more than the people of this country, and I would not do anything to see them go out of business if I could prevent it; that is the reason I am fighting against this bill, I want to do it in the American way. If we had a tariff of 10 cents more than we do now you would not need this bill, and the sheep growers in this country would not want it. They would not be after this legislation. But the fact of the matter is that today the State Department and the President are interested in cutting the 35-cent duty on scoured import wools down to we know not what, and we are raising the price of wool at the highest price we have had in 27 years, and we expect the Treasury to make up the difference. If there is any sense in that then I do not know anything about business, I do not know anything about how to take care of the American people, and I think it is absolutely the wrong thing to do. We should not pass this legislation. If the President and the State Department cut the tariff down on this commodity, we know who is responsible for it. It is the Chief Executive and the State Department, and if they are going to ruin all the business in this country, as will ultimately come—and I stake anything I have on that in any statement I make—eventually the competition in foreign countries will do away with our high standard of living in America, and that is just what you are faced with, and you are going to see it happen inside of 3 or 4 years. It is a calamity to America when it happens.

The greatest woolen industry outside of the American Woolen Co. in this country is the Forstman Co., in New Jersey. That company started by German people coming over here and building a plant in this country, because we had a tariff that protected the American woolen industry. They made the fabric here and employed American labor. Previous to that they manufactured stuff in foreign countries and employed foreign labor and brought the fabrics over here. The tariff on woollens caused them to come over here and build their woolen mills. It did a great good for our country. We gave employment here to our American people.

Now what will happen? Those people will go back to Germany and employ people there, or in some other foreign country, and the American worker and the American manufacturer will not be in business. I am not talking because I am directly interested in it. I can see the difficulty we are going to have with all American industries—everything. I stand before you and before my people as a protectionist for the American industry, American labor, and the American people, and the only way you are ever going to have a successful America and the thing that made this country great is to keep this tariff. It made America great, it encouraged industry and agriculture, and it raised the standard of living to the highest of any nation of the world. Now you permit the Democratic President and the State Department to tear it down, to wreck our economy. Stop it. Republicans, wake up and protect America from the New Dealers before it is too late.

Vote for the Herter amendment.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, of course, everybody who knows anything about American agriculture and American business knows that our reciprocal trade arrangements saved both of them. Some people are so archaic in their thinking that they still talk in the days of 40 and 50 years ago about world trade and world commerce. I think that 90 percent of the membership of this House believes that the United States of America should have a wool industry, and unless we have support prices in times like these we are not going to have a wool industry. We consume in the United States of America in normal times about 1,000,000,000 pounds of wool. We produce under the circumstances now 300,000,000 pounds. If it were for nothing else at all than for our own self-protection, for our own national defense, we should and must have a wool industry. I want to see this bill pass. I voted against the one that passed the House and was vetoed by the President. I stated then that if we would go along and pass the bill the Senate had passed, we would have wool support. Now, in the closing hours of this session, if this bill is amended and has to go back to the other body for concurrence or for conference, in my opinion we will have no wool-support legislation, which I think is so essential to the wool industry and to the country in general. Therefore, I trust that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts will not be agreed to.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAYBURN. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. Is it not a fact that if we were to follow the philosophy of the gentleman from Pennsylvania who has just addressed the House, the burden on the taxpayers of America, that is, the consuming public, would be far greater than the burden upon the taxpayers as provided for in this bill?

Mr. RAYBURN. Everybody who is thinking in terms of modern times agrees to that.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wyoming?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, of course I am in favor of this bill. I quite agree with the gentleman from Texas, the distinguished minority leader [Mr. RAYBURN], that if we adopt this amendment or any other amendment it will have the same effect as voting down the bill.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] made the statement that wool is higher now than it has been in 25 years. That is not true. It has been higher during several years in the twenties than it is now.

Let us take a look at the effect of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HERTER]. At the outset of the war the Department of Agriculture set up this wool-purchase program. Officials of that Department promised the wool growers of this country that the program would continue during the war and for 2 years thereafter. That is precisely the same way that other farm commodities are treated under the Steagall amendment. Under the program wool was purchased at the ceiling price established by OPA just 2 days after Pearl Harbor. That price has not changed since then, and under this bill the same price will be paid until the end of next year. Because of the fact that the Government was purchasing the domestic wool the price was not increased, although the costs of production increased 66 percent during the war. Now it is true that a good many other farm commodities were supported on the basis of 90 percent of parity or even over 100 percent of parity, but bear in mind that every one of those commodities were granted substantial increases in prices during the war, while wool received no increase whatsoever. The average increase granted 24 principal farm commodities during the war was 94 percent. I might mention a few increases: Rye, 233 percent; corn, 144 percent; cotton, 101 percent; peanuts, 100 percent; and hay, 94 percent.

Now, as I have pointed out, Mr. Chairman, all of these other farm commodities that have been supported on the basis of a percentage of parity enjoyed substantial increases all during the war, while, on the other hand, the price of wool remained fixed, and that is why it is so unfair to change the rules of the game now, as proposed by the amendment of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HERTER], and put wool on a percentage of parity. Obviously, the amendment of the gentleman from Massachusetts is wholly unfair and inequitable to the great wool industry of this country.

Now, Mr. Chairman, we are here to represent the interests of the people of our States and the Nation as a whole. Wyoming is second in wool production in this country. Texas and the West produce the great bulk of our domestic wool. Our only market for wool is right here in America. Practically all of our

wool is sold to dealers in Massachusetts and Pennsylvania. Of course, this country is also the best market for growers in Australia, New Zealand, South Africa, and South America. Now bear this in mind—about 70 percent of the wool dealers in Massachusetts and Pennsylvania deal exclusively in foreign wool, and, quite naturally, they are concerned with the interests of the foreign producers. In the final analysis, that is the conflict here today. We in the West are trying to protect the interests of the wool growers of this country as against the foreign producer. Last year, while over a billion pounds of wool were consumed in this country, yet the fact remains that 819,000,000 pounds of foreign wool was imported into this country during the same time. Foreign producers, therefore, got over 81 percent of our market last year.

Now let us see how the wool growers of this country got into this predicament. The fact of the matter is that the wool industry of this country is a war casualty. During the past 5 years, we produced in this country 2,071,762,000 pounds of wool. The production by years is as follows:

1942	459,073,000
1943	449,578,000
1944	418,094,000
1945	387,017,000
1946	358,000,000

The Commodity Credit Corporation purchased all of this wool. The Government owns and holds a stock pile of wool of 460,000,000 pounds and, consequently, during the war years, we were able to sell only 1,600,000,000 pounds of domestic wool. We simply could not compete with the cheap foreign producer and if it were not for the fact that the Army and Navy required domestic wool in the manufacture of military fabrics, we would not have been able to have sold any of our domestic production.

Now, during the same 5 years we consumed 5,398,551,000 pounds of wool in this country. Our consumption during those years was as follows:

1942	1,123,094,000
1943	1,109,140,000
1944	1,050,651,000
1945	1,053,666,000
1946	1,062,000,000

During the last 5 years there were 3,530,989,000 pounds of wool imported into this country. The imports during those years were as follows:

1942	782,647,000
1943	642,887,000
1944	582,168,000
1945	704,034,000
1946	819,253,000

Now then, we consumed over 5,000,000,000 pounds of wool in this country during the last 5 years and we produced 2,000,000,000 pounds of wool but were able to sell in our own market only one billion and a half pounds of wool and that is why we have a stock pile of nearly one-half a billion pounds of wool at the present time, which stock pile represents a distinct threat to the American wool producer and, if this bill is not passed, will mean the eventual liquidation of that great industry. The fact remains that while we consumed 5,000,000,000 pounds of wool in this

country during the last 5 years, foreign producers supplied 3,500,000,000 pounds of that wool or 65 percent of the total. With our high cost of production here at home, we simply cannot compete with the low-cost producers abroad and unless we have this bill, the wool industry of this country faces complete liquidation.

Now during the last 5 years the 3,500,000,000 pounds of foreign wool that was brought into this country paid tariff duties into the Treasury amounting to \$604,600,000. So the Treasury of the United States has benefited to the extent of over \$600,000,000 because of the very imports that are causing all of the difficulties of the American wool producers today. The fact of the matter is that the total tariff paid on all imports of every kind and character including wool during the same 5 years amounted to \$1,919,600,000 and therefore the tariff on wool amounts to about one-third of all the duties paid during that time.

Under the law 30 percent of the tariff receipts are used to support farm commodities under section 32 of the AAA Act. And so, during the last 5 years, \$181,100,000 of the receipts from the tariff paid on foreign wool imported into this country has been used to support farm commodities. The following is a list of all duties paid during the past 5 years, including the duties on wool imports during that period:

Year	Duties on all dutiable imports	Total sec. 32 funds (30 percent)	Duties on wool imports	Sec. 32 fund from wool (30 percent)
1942	\$320,160,000	\$97,000,000	\$99,400,000	\$29,800,000
1943	392,300,000	119,000,000	126,900,000	38,000,000
1944	347,300,000	114,300,000	107,300,000	32,100,000
1945	378,700,000	118,100,000	128,800,000	38,600,000
1946	481,200,000	148,000,000	142,200,000	42,600,000
Total 5-year av.	1,919,600,000	596,400,000	604,600,000	181,100,000
	383,920,000	119,280,000	120,920,000	36,220,000

Notwithstanding the fact that during the last 5 years over \$181,000,000 from the tariff receipts on imported wool into this country was set over to support agricultural commodities, yet not 1 cent of that fund has been used to support wool in any way, shape, or form. Last year, over \$20,000,000 was used for the benefit of the cotton industry. Millions were spent for the support of other agricultural commodities, but none of these funds have been used to support wool. Now, Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that the Government received over \$600,000,000 from the tariff on wool, it seems strange to me that anyone would object to spending a few million dollars to support the wool industry when it is so clearly shown that it is these tremendous foreign imports that are causing our trouble today.

Now it is true, as was pointed out yesterday, by the gentleman from Kansas, that there is a better demand at the present time for long-staple, fine wools of a high shrink, and that the market on that grade of wool is a cent or two higher than the support price under this bill. That has been occasioned by the fact that England is taking all of that type of wool from its Dominions and, conse-

quently, our own mills are required to purchase our fine wools. The fact remains that the only wools that are being purchased at the present time are the cream of the crop. They are the most desirable wools. These wools represent roughly about 25 percent of our production and so we do have a market for about 75,000,000 out of the 300,000,000 pounds of wool that we produce in this country. These wools are used for worsteds and serge textiles, but the fact remains that we have no market at all for the other 225,000,000 pounds of our domestic wool, most of which is of the coarser grades and goes into woolens.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I have pointed out that the Treasury of the United States has benefited because of the predicament of the domestic wool producer and by virtue of the tremendous imports of duty-paid foreign wool. And so, it seems to me, that we have made a good case for the support of our wool industry even though it may cost a few million dollars. But, Mr. Chairman, let there be no mistake about this. The wool growers of the country are not the only ones concerned with this bill. The Government has a stock pile of 460,000,000 pounds of wool. The Government, therefore, is interested in this bill. Under the law, the Commodity Credit Corporation cannot sell that wool at less than parity. They are unable to sell it under the law at the present time and this bill gives them the right to sell that wool at less than parity. At the present time there is a tremendous demand for this wool, but in order to sell it, the law must be changed so they can sell it at less than parity and in competition with foreign wools. And so, I want to impress upon those people who are concerned with losses to the Government with the fact that unless this bill is passed, the United States will be unable to sell its stock pile of wool and they will be required to hold it in storage. If this bill passes, they can sell the wool at a loss of a few million dollars, but if the bill fails to pass, then I venture the prediction that the loss to the Government from its own stock pile will run up from twenty to fifty million dollars.

It seems to me, therefore, Mr. Chairman, that the conclusion is irresistible that this bill should be passed without amendment in order to protect, first, the Government of the United States against loss on its stock pile and, second, to give the wool growers of this country the measure of protection that they are justly entitled to. I hope this bill passes.

I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Rich].

Mr. RICH. I want to protect the Treasury. That is what I am trying to do now.

Mr. BARRETT. Then you had better vote against this amendment and vote in favor of the bill.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am very happy that the record now discloses that the leadership of the Democratic side of the House are in favor of protecting the wool industry of this country providing only they

can do it in their own way. They are not in favor of having it done as the majority of both the House and Senate said it should be done, in legislation which passed Congress earlier this session.

Today this body is confronted with a shotgun held by Mr. Will Clayton pointed directly at us, as he says, in effect, "If you want to save this essential industry of the United States, you must do it my way, as the Democratic Party through the State Department directs." Those on the Republican side who are in favor of this bill recognize that the wool industry is essential to the United States. They are willing to make a concession to good business practices in order to save that industry.

Of course, the real issue is whether or not any industry of this country sometime in the future will find itself in a similar position, and be forced to come before a Congress and ask that the Treasury be tapped in order that industry may continue to exist in the United States, in the face of excessive imports from overseas.

Think of it. Here is an American industry having as competition 90 percent of the domestic consumption coming in from overseas. Hence we have today this essential industry here on its knees begging for its life. It is a shotgun procedure, one which I sincerely hope future Congresses will bear in mind by protecting the industry and the jobs of American citizens.

At this moment in Geneva State Department traders are bargaining away this essential industry. They are selling this essential industry down the river. These statesmen are bargaining it away, while the President and Will Clayton cry that if we merely protect with an adequate tariff an essential industry here, if we seek merely to protect our own essential farm industries, they say the great prospective International Trade Organization will collapse. What nonsense it is to suppose that an international organization built upon so flimsy a foundation can be sound, that removing a few sheep and protecting an essential industry here would break down that organization. How foolish to build an international organization so defective that it will not permit this Nation to protect an industry essential to its safety. Such an organization is but a house of cards, and surely will fall.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Not at this time.

Of course, what the Democratic Party wants to do is to make every industry dependent upon the Government, so that every industry in your district and my district will have to come to Congress and get subsidy from the taxpayer to permit that industry to live.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. I yield.

Mr. REED of New York. There is one thing that always seems to have been forgotten in these discussions, and that is that just as soon as you have permitted foreign competition to destroy an essen-

tial industry in this country, then they have a monopoly and can charge any price they want to for a product that is essential to the very life of the Nation.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Past experience has proved that beyond question. We know that today there are some 2,000,000,000 pounds of wool lying offshore in some foreign land, simply waiting an opportunity to be shipped in here, to still further depress our market. So we propose to reduce the tariff still further at Geneva, to invite foreigners to import more and more wool, and then under this bill to make up the loss to our American wool growers out of the Treasury.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. Does not the gentleman agree that the consuming public will have to bear the burden if we are to increase import duties?

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. I wonder who the gentleman thinks pays taxes into the Treasury. It is the consuming public who are the taxpayers. I have heard that argument repeatedly, the implication being that the Treasury of the United States get its money by merely running a printing press, not realizing that we have no sources of revenue other than through taxes and import duties and by the sale of our securities. I answer the gentleman that we are here to protect the Treasury of the United States, the Republican Party has been fighting as hard as we could all year to reduce expenditures, to eliminate waste. I must say the gentleman's party has not given us the kind of support we had a right to anticipate.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, on May 22 I urged the passage of a wool bill which was passed but later vetoed by President Truman. As I understand the bill now being considered, the bill is identical with the old one except it omits a provision requiring the President to impose fees on imports if the Tariff Commission makes the finding that foreign wool materially interferes with the domestic wool program. I sincerely felt that this was a fair provision.

Even without this provision, the wool bill up for consideration today merits our support. It protects to a degree our wool growers by insuring them a support price until December 31, 1948, at the 1946 price and authorizes the Commodity Credit Corporation to sell its wool at competitive prices with foreign wool. This support price is absolutely essential. Wool production has dropped 35 percent in recent years because of the lack of profit in raising sheep. An important reason why wool production must be maintained at a high level is that wool is considered a strategic and critical material necessary for the security of the Nation, according to a recent finding by the Army and Navy Munitions Board. This means we must encourage rather

than discourage the production of wool in the United States. Without a support price, production will decrease even more rapidly than it has in the past years.

For these important reasons, I shall support the wool bill.

(Mr. ROBERTSON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I want to inject a note into this discussion that I believe has not been touched on yet. A decline in the price of wool will affect adversely some of the wards of this Government whom you wish to protect, the Indians.

Often, when discussions arise on this floor regarding any industry in the West, we are apt to think of big men, and we frequently call them barons; copper barons, lumber barons, or some other kind of baron. That simply attempts to pull the wool over the eyes of those who do not think carefully and to substitute prejudice for argument.

I am here to talk about the small man, white or red, who is engaged in the wool industry. There are plenty of small men thus engaged. They are not all big men. It has already been pointed out that the amendment which the gentleman has just offered, if adopted, will depress the price of wool. I do not want to see the price of wool depressed. It is an essential industry. It is an industry which the welfare of the country demands be kept continuously operating and producing. Therefore, we do not want to crush or harm that industry.

The cost of wool production has been increasing. As I said when the bill was before the House recently, there are hundreds of millions of acres of land in the West that are fit for nothing else but grazing. Some of it is not fit for cattle grazing, but only for sheep production. In the State of Arizona, because of the vast unoccupied stretches of area of hostile nature, the Legislature of Arizona has passed a law that no flock of sheep can be attended by one shepherd or herder. We do not permit one man alone to go out in the vastness into the wilderness to take care of a flock of sheep. No man alone can do that, whether he is the owner or merely a hired man, and regardless of the size of the flock to tend.

The owner of that flock of sheep must provide at least two shepherds, or herders, for every flock of sheep because they are distant most of the time from human habitation and in case one man is alone and has an accident, is bitten by a rattler, or something else happens, some other kind of accident, there must be some companion besides his dog to take care of him. All of these things make it unavoidable that the cost of wool production in our West has increased and must increase, and imperative that

we get better prices. We cannot compete with foreign production in any such way as this amendment would require us to.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield.

Mr. GRANGER. I think the gentleman will agree with me that the only thing that the wool growers asked for was a law that would bring them into parity with other agricultural commodities. That is the thing we asked for in the first place. We did not ask for any tariff, we did not ask for anything; that is all we tried to do. They wanted to be put on parity and they wanted legislation to permit the Department to sell this great stockpile of wool. That is what this legislation does and the only thing it does, and does the thing the wool growers wanted in the first place and what the gentleman from Arizona wanted.

Mr. MURDOCK. And with the high cost of production this bill not amended—and it must not be amended or we will have no bill at all, as has already been explained—this bill will give the small producers some aid. I pointed out yesterday that 60,000 Navajo Indians who are right up against their limit of subsistence must depend upon the sheep industry, they must depend upon their wool. They eat their lambs, that is their food supply. Their sale of wool is the only means on their vast reservation they have of existence. If you take it away from them you will throw them onto Federal relief, and they do not want charity.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Is it not true, I will ask my colleague, that there are many many millions of acres of land in the United States that cannot be used efficiently except through the sheep industry?

Mr. MURDOCK. Yes. That was the very point of my statement a moment ago. You kill this industry and you turn back to the desert and to savage wild life all of this land which is now being used to support sheep and the sheep industry.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield.

Mr. RICH. The gentleman says he is for a high price. I want a high price for wool so that the men who grow it can receive the benefit of it. But I ask the gentleman if he is in favor of cutting the tariff down now from 34 cents? If the gentleman is interested in the sheep industry does he want to cut the tariff? Yes or no? I would like a yes or no answer.

Mr. MURDOCK. Usually I do not like yes or no questions. I have time after time again appeared before the Committee on Reciprocity Information and expressed myself. It is in the RECORD. I hope this amendment will be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I would expect three categories of Congressmen to oppose this wool bill. These categories are:

First. Congressmen whose districts produce no substantial quantities of wool.

Second. Congressmen who disapprove subsidies.

Third. Congressmen who subscribe to the principles of the Republican Party.

If these three groups vote against this bad bill, as I hope they will, it will receive the fate it deserves. I will support the Herter amendment and vote against the bill.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

[Mr. FISHER addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, let us all get firmly in our minds the exact situation that now exists. If the Herter amendment to this bill is adopted, the bill is dead. Then if the representatives of this country at Geneva decide, on the theory that the wool industry and the sheep industry, as Under Secretary of State Will Clayton claims represents less than one-half of 1 percent of the income of those engaged in agriculture and animal industry, then they will throw our sheep and wool industry out the window, the bars will be down, and the markets of this country will be flooded with foreign wool, and the wool growers of this country and the producers of sheep will be put out of business. I can understand why a man who thinks of the American sheep industry in terms of wool in the factory, or lamb chops or a leg of lamb in the hotel or restaurant or on the home table, just thinks of it as so much wool or so much meat, but I think of it as the small farm flocks of my State. We do not raise sheep down there by the thousands, but there are hundreds of farms all over Tennessee that have flocks of sheep ranging from 50 to 200. It is a profitable industry. It is a substantial part of the income of our farmers.

Well, they say that you are going to make the people who buy woolen clothing pay higher prices. If there is any Member on this floor who has paid \$80 for a woolen suit of clothes, he has paid, in buying that \$80 suit, less than \$2 for the wool that is in it. If it is a \$40 suit, he has paid for the wool in his suit not more than \$2. This price for wool that the consumer pays does not hurt anybody. The high cost of woolen clothing is not caused by the 45 cents per pound that our wool growers will receive under this bill. High prices are caused largely by the cost of manufacturing the clothing.

The trouble is this. We have all got a little bit too much of this thing called human nature in us. I heard a profound student of mankind say once that there is a heap of human nature in a man, and from my observation, there is is some in a woman too.

In the olden days two women lived together in the same house. Each was the mother of a baby boy. One of the women overlayed her baby in the night and it died. When she realized her child was dead, she arose and placed it in the bosom of the other woman and took her live child to her own bed, appropriating it as her own. In the morning when the mother of the live child awoke, she realized it had been stolen, and went over and got into a row with the woman who had stolen her baby. They took the controversy to King Solomon. The King said, "Bring me a sword." And, they brought the King a sword and when it was brought in he said to his attendant, "Take the sword and divide the living child and give half to the one and half to the other."

Then said the mother of the living child, "O my Lord, give her the living child and in nowise slay it." Then the King said, "Give her the living child for it is hers. She is the mother thereof."

Now, the Members of this House who are interested in a live sheep industry in this country do not want it halved with any country on earth. I do not want the time to come when the American people are dependent upon any country on earth for a strategic material like wool or an edible product like lamb chops or a leg of lamb or even a shoulder of lamb or breast of lamb. It is a wonderful food, and when the wintertime comes I want some wool socks. I remember, as a boy, I always took the precaution to have two pairs of wool socks each winter. I would buy two hanks of wool, take them to Aunt Sarah Phillips, and she would knit them for me, and until spring came and I turned out barefooted, I wore those wool socks interchangeably.

Let us defeat the Herter amendment and save this industry and take care of the wool and the sheep growers in this country. Brother HERTER, it is partly for your benefit that I am making this plea. If the time should come when you are dependent wholly upon the Australian and New Zealand growers of wool, you will have to pay \$1 a pound and like it, and I want to save you from yourself.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last eight words.

Mr. Chairman, I do not like this bill in its present form. When there is a protection job to be done, I think we should proceed directly to the job. What should have happened, an adequate tariff, one which would afford protection to the American woolen industry, should have been provided. Because they have not an adequate tariff protection at the present time, the American woolen industry has grown smaller and smaller with the passing of the years to the point where they are today only able to supply a small percentage of the domestic demand.

But the bill under consideration is nevertheless a protection measure. It presents the only opportunity that is open to us to protect this industry which is in such dire straits. Because it is the only method offered to protect the industry, to give it a chance to grow and

enlarge until it can supply the American market, I, as a Republican, am supporting the bill.

I do not like the approach to the problem which the bill presents, no Republican likes the method, but it is the only way of achieving the objective we have in mind—protection for an industry that is desperately in need of it.

I want to see the wool industry adequately protected against foreign competition, not only for the benefit of our fellow citizens who are engaged in the production of wool but for the better protection of my country against a possible foreign foe. Wool is a strategic and critical material. We would lose any war in which we became involved if we could not supply the needs of this Nation in wool. Everyone knows that but nobody thinks of that now since we have just won a great war and the dangers from beyond the seas has seemingly passed us by. But there ought to be people in this Hall, if there are none beyond this historic legislative Chamber, who ought to vividly recall that one of the greatest sources of worry we had during the early days of the war emergency arose out of the scarcity of wool and the uncertainty of a sufficient supply.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GEARHART. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. The gentleman is a member of the Committee on Ways and Means. It is the duty of that committee and always has been to fix the tariff on imports to this country.

Mr. GEARHART. I wish the gentleman would not consume my time by pointing to the shortcomings of the Ways and Means Committee. We admit them. We have many of them. We want to provide adequate protection for every American industry, and if the bill under consideration provided it the gentleman would be just as opposed to it as he is to the instant bill. I support this bill because I know that it will provide by indirection the protection which a direct tariff would grant otherwise. Ours is a fundamental disagreement. Let us not obscure the issue by discussing distinctions without differences. I am sure that the genial gentleman will forgive me if I return to the discussion of the bill.

In the old days we used to take evidence in respect to every industry and ascertain just what that industry needed in protection in the interest of that particular industry. We have been induced to embark upon another program, on the ground that no American industry will receive any less consideration than that received under the old system. That is, it would be judged in its own interest and not in the interest of another industry. But in the administration of the reciprocal trade agreements program we find a new idea has crept in, an idea of deciding which is the most important industry, this one or that one, and, having reached a decision as to which is the most important in the estimation of the internationally minded, they proceed to protect that industry by gaining for it advances in foreign markets to increase

its foreign trade at the expense of the less important one, which they consign to destruction.

Everyone knows, it is an open secret, that in Geneva one of the key commodities upon which dealing is being had is wool. Down south of the Equator are several countries that raise lots of sheep and much wool. Australia, New Zealand, and South Africa are determined to get their wool into this, the only cash dollar market on the face of the earth, and their negotiators at Geneva are working, maneuvering, and scheming night and day in the effort to gain access to this market. What are they hoping to accomplish? They are simply demanding that the American tariff on wool be cut. They will grant no concessions in their markets to us unless they gain this. Wool is the key to the success of the Geneva negotiations, at least from the standpoint of Assistant Secretary of State Will Clayton whose contempt for national boundaries, including our own, is well known to all. If the tariff on wool is cut and we do not pass the cushioning legislation, the wool industry will be sacrificed. In the interest of what industries would the wool industry be sacrificed? What industries would benefit? The answer to that is not difficult. The great metal-fabricating industries, of which the automobile, electrical appliances, agricultural implements, and rail and rail equipment industries are high on the list of favored industries down at the State Department. All the smiles of the State Department are for them. The lowly wool industry has no friends there. The question is: Will these bright boys down behind the silken curtains in the State Department, these open-handed, "striped pantied" boys, be permitted to sacrifice the wool industry in order to get American automobiles, and American electrical appliances into the countries south of the Equator? That question is to be answered in the action of the House on this bill, and, especially, in our attitude toward the amendment we now have under consideration, purposed, as it is, to cut the heart out of the protective provisions of the measure we are now discussing. Let us kill the amendment and pass the bill with a resounding voice vote that will forever put at rest any doubt in respect to where the membership of this House stands on the right of an American industry to adequate protection against unequal and unfair competition from abroad.

(Mr. GEARHART asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, being deeply interested in agriculture, I am interested in your approach to the wool problem and the effort by this amendment and the purpose of this amendment to put all agricultural products in one category as to parity. Being interested in national defense, I have approached the wool problem from quite a different angle, and I cannot agree with the proponents of this amendment that wool must be squeezed

into uniform treatment with other agricultural products.

Wool is the only agricultural product which stands in this category. It is the only American agricultural product listed as a strategic material. It cannot be stock piled successfully over a period of time. It must be rotated, and the best stock pile of wool that you can build is a source of production of wool and this production record must be maintained for our own adequate defense needs. That puts wool in an entirely different situation than other agricultural products.

I want to mention one point that was alluded to by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. JENNINGS] when he called attention to the wool manufacturers concerning the dilemma they would be in when the time might come that they would be dependent upon foreign sources and foreign price controls for their supply.

I had a very real experience in my own background. I was with the Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co. back in 1920 when the American rubber industry was dependent on foreign supplies of rubber. If you know the history of the rubber industry in the 1920's you know how deeply it affected us. I was with the Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co. when the 1920 collapse came and I know what happened to the American rubber manufacturing industry when they found themselves subject to the control of the British-Dutch cartel on rubber. That made a rather deep and lasting impression on me, and I now see the wool manufacturers drifting into exactly the same dilemma that we were in in the twenties on rubber.

This matter of making all agricultural products go in lock step under uniform treatment is just about as logical as an experience I had in the Army one time out in Arizona when I had a lieutenant colonel who called the bandmaster to task. We had a wonderful band in our regiment and we were very proud of it. We had a regimental review one day and the lieutenant colonel in my presence called the bandmaster down because the trombones were not moving in exact unison as the band marched by the reviewing stand. There is just about as much logic in your asking that all agricultural products conform to one formula of parity as there was in that lieutenant colonel's viewpoint as to the trombones.

Wool does not belong in the same category with other agricultural products when it comes to this matter of parity. I am very much interested to see that wool is given enough special treatment to insure us an American source of supply so that the wool manufacturers and the producers of wool in America will not find themselves in the same dilemma that we were in in the 1920's when we had to reorganize the whole automobile-tire industry. You will get into that situation if you make America wholly dependent upon a foreign-price structure. We must treat wool in a different category than any other agricultural product. It just does not fit our needs to have it put in the parity program in exact conformance with other agricultural products.

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. I yield.

Mr. HERTER. I think the gentleman will recall that when this matter was first debated I took the position, first, that wool should have a support price and, second, that we should dispose of the surplus held by the Commodity Credit Corporation because it would deteriorate. The principal reason that I feel it should not be set at a fixed price is because we are setting a precedent there regardless of wool or anything else. The administration set that price above 90 percent or at 90 percent of parity, whatever is required to maintain the industry.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. And the gentleman is in agreement on the fixing of that price.

Mr. HERTER. By discretion.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. May I ask the gentleman: Why do you insist on 90 percent of parity?

Mr. HERTER. We do not insist, but I say not less than 90 percent, because that is the standard formula that has been fixed.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Do you think that wool should be made to fit that standard?

Mr. HERTER. I do.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. There is where I disagree with the gentleman. It should not be made to fit that standard. It should be given such special treatment as to enable our wool producers to stay in the business and thereby strengthen our national economy and our national defense.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN] has expired.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, this subject has been pretty thoroughly discussed, and there are other important measures pressing for consideration.

I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment, and all amendments thereto, close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

Mr. ENGLE of California. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment, and all amendments thereto, close in 5 minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] is recognized for one-half minute.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, in one-half minute, let me say just one thing. It seems to me that if we can avoid amending this proposal we can greatly facilitate the goal for which we strive, because it will not jeopardize the eventual results, since this is the last day of the session. If this bill gets caught up in a conference, we may not get this important wool legislation at all. It seems to me it behooves us to reject the Herter amendment and accept the proposal as it came to us from the Senate so we do not jeopardize this entire wool program at this time. Even the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HERTER] agrees we need legislation of this type; he argues that we should adopt his amendment be-

cause it is sound in principle; regardless of that contention, Mr. Chairman, and without admitting or refuting it in these few seconds it should be crystal clear that the safe, sound, and sensible thing to do on this final day of the current session is to pass this measure as it came to us from the Senate so no conference will be required and so no risk will be incurred about losing the legislation altogether. We must not risk having this measure defeated by default through sending it to committee. I urge you to reject the Herter amendment and to support this measure in its present form.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has expired.

The gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HILL] is recognized for one-half minute.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I support this bill as it comes from the Senate. I am confident that if we amend the bill in any manner whatsoever we will lose it. This is only temporary legislation. It only extends to January 1, 1949. So we are only trying to provide a bridge over which our sheep industry may be able to travel during the postwar era.

Under the Herter amendment the wool producers would be at the mercy of a changing market which might well lead to a complete destruction of our domestic wool industry.

The Herter amendment should be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Colorado has expired.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] is recognized for one-half minute.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I intend to support the Herter amendment because it is moderate. I will speak on another section of the bill, on the issue of the high cost of living, as a representative of a city district; a question which I think it is essential Members bear in mind when they go home.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Montana [Mr. D'EWART] is recognized for one-half minute.

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Chairman, this legislation is exceedingly important to my district and to my State, which is the third largest wool-producing State in the Nation. The adoption of the Herter amendment and failure to pass this bill will be a disaster to the economy of my district. I sincerely trust the amendment will be rejected and the bill be passed.

Mr. Chairman, the facts concerning the wool industry are well known to everyone. It is an important industry in peacetime, and it is indispensable in war. We cannot afford to be without a healthy wool industry, yet we are permitting it to diminish steadily by our failure to establish an adequate wool program and to provide any protection against foreign imports. Indeed, there is a very real danger that tariffs on wool will be further reduced in the near future.

In the meantime the wool industry is providing, through the tariff duties, funds for subsidies for cotton and wheat, for school lunches, for relief and distribution of surplus farm products. These are the section 32 funds, 30 percent of our receipts from imports. During the

past 6 or 7 years the duties on wool alone have constituted about 30 percent of our tariff receipts. Wool supports these many programs, but there is no support for wool.

Uncertainty about the future has resulted in a constant decrease in the sheep population of this country. In Montana, where the grazing of livestock is the only way to produce wealth from thousands of acres of public lands, the sheep population has diminished from 5,000,000 head to 2,500,000 head. Income from wool, one of our most important commodities, has gone steadily downward.

The legislation we are considering today is vital to the wool industry, and to the same extent it is important to the economy of the entire West. We cannot afford to let the wool industry perish from neglect. We cannot afford to subsidize foreign wool growers at the expense of the American sheepman. For these reasons I believe that it is the clear duty of the Congress to provide the wool program proposed in the legislation under consideration today.

(Mr. D'EWART asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. LEMKE] is recognized for one-half minute.

(Mr. LEMKE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Chairman, I am against the Herter amendment and for the bill as it was passed by the Senate.

Mr. Chairman, I am going to vote for S. 1498 known as the Senate wool bill. I voted for the House wool bill that the President vetoed. I am sorry that the President vetoed it. I know that he was misinformed by the State Department or rather by a millionaire in the State Department, Bill Clayton.

I have felt for some time and I feel now that the President should never veto a bill just because some Cabinet officer asks him to do so. The President should be mindful that Congress still writes the Nation's laws. His cabinet is to advise him how to execute, observe, and enforce those laws. It is none of their business the kind of laws that Congress passes.

The Congress, and the Congress alone, is directly responsible to the people of the Nation. They elect the Members. The President should never permit or seriously consider the objections of any of his cabinet as to legislation that Congress passed.

It is true that he should consider the merits of their suggestions, but in order to do that he should invite the author of the bill and the chairmen of the committees of both the House and Senate before whose committee the legislation was considered. Only in this way can he become aware of the merits and demerits of the legislation. Ex-party proceedings and star-chamber proceedings are un-American. The President should abolish that practice. It has been indulged in too long for the good of our Nation by his predecessors.

Therefore, I suggest that it is the sense of Congress that hereafter the President call in before he veto any bill the author of the bill and the chairmen of both the

House and Senate of the committees that reported the legislation favorably after full hearings.

I hope that this suggestion will reach the President and I am confident that hereafter he will act upon it. It is only fair and just to Congress.

I am not going to discuss the merits of S. 1498. It is only a half-way measure. Further legislation will be necessary if the wool industry is to survive.

I am informed that Bill Clayton in the State Department says that wool is such a small percentage of our economy that we can afford to let it die, so that the British may supply us with wool. I presume that this millionaire who made his millions in cotton transactions with Great Britain does not know that lamb chops and leg of lamb comes from the same animal that produces the wool.

I state frankly to you that no industry in America should be permitted to die in order to build up foreign industries at the expense of the taxpayers. That un-American doctrine has no place here. I say this without apologies to the blind followers of Bill Clayton.

In closing, may I suggest to the wool growers that they better get busy and help us to get cost of production for agriculture. I suggest that they get a copy of H. R. 794, and read it and study it. If this bill is passed, then the wool industry and the sheep industry together with some forty other agricultural products will be protected from those who would sell our Nation down the river.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLE].

Mr. ENGLE of California. Mr. Chairman, I am supporting this bill and am opposed to the Herter amendment. The Herter amendment is a grave injustice to the industry, if adopted, because it freezes on the industry a parity formula which is unjust and should be revised, but in addition and what is more important—the amendment will kill the bill. We have not a chance of getting a conference and getting this bill through both the Senate and the House if the amendment is adopted. The Herter amendment will mean a difference to the domestic producer of between 42 and 36 cents. The old parity formula will reflect a price of about 36 cents a pound. As stated by some of the previous speakers, there has been a constant effort on the part of the wool industry to get an adjustment of this parity formula. One of the original bills considered by the Committee on Agriculture contained a provision for a revision of the parity formula. It is conceded by everybody that such parity formula should take place. However, the provision was stricken out because some of the committee members felt that the revision of the parity formula for wool should go along with a general consideration of a revision of all parity formulas, and I understand the Committee on Agriculture intends to make a general study of the whole subject. It will therefore be unfair to adopt the Herter amendment and to fix a parity formula on the wool industry which admittedly is not in line. For that reason, and the further and im-

pending reason that we cannot possibly as a practical matter get this legislation through on time if we adopt the amendment, I urge that it be defeated.

(Mr. ENGLE of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLANNAGAN] is recognized.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Chairman, this bill has the support of all American wool growers. It has the support of all the great farm organizations. It has the unanimous support of the House Committee on Agriculture. If we do not pass this legislation, it means that the wool industry will not only be crippled but will be put out of business. It is this or nothing, and I trust that the Herter amendment will be voted down and that the legislation will pass.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LECOMPTE] for one-half minute.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Chairman, I wish to ask the chairman of the Agriculture Committee how many pounds of raw wool goes into the manufacture of a suit of clothes that costs \$75?

Mr. HOPE. I refer the gentleman to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, an expert in that line.

Mr. RICH. Two and one-half pounds.

Mr. LECOMPTE. The reason I ask is because I do not believe the price of wool has much to do with the retail price of a suit of clothes.

Mr. RICH. Two and one-half pounds. The thing here is not how the increased price of wool is reflected in the cost of a finished suit.

Mr. LECOMPTE. I have a feeling that the price of wool does not have much to do with the high cost of a suit of clothes, since only a relatively small amount of wool is required for a suit of woollen clothes.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired, all time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HERTER].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HERTER) there were—ayes 67, noes 113.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were refused.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. The provisions of sections 385, 386, and 388 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, shall be applicable to the support operations carried out pursuant to the first section of this act.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made earlier today.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I will not try to detain the Committee very long, but I do feel that what I have to say to the Committee is important enough to take the time

of the Members on the last day. I am a new Member, and it is not lightly that I would detain the Committee on the last day.

I am really concerned about what we have done on this wool bill. I represent a city district. In my city district people consume agricultural commodities; they do not create them. The people of my city district need the things the farmers produce, and the farmers need the materials my people produce—clothing, building materials, construction materials, mechanical appliances, automobiles, medicines, machinery, and a host of other goods and services.

The Nation today is interdependent. I say this particularly to my colleagues from the farm districts. It used to be argued that if life on the farm was not made worth while the farmer would not farm and we in the city could not live because he would not produce the things we have to have to eat and live. But it is equally true today that unless you make it worth while for the city dweller to make the machinery, clothes, construction materials, medicines, and all the other things the farmer needs to get along with, the farmer would not be able to live either. We are each dependent upon the other.

I would like to stress this point with respect to the Herter amendment. The Herter amendment was a moderate amendment. It proposed to continue a plan for price support of agricultural commodities which has been going on for a long time, and which will come up for review in the Congress next year. Instead of the moderate approach the choice was made not to adopt the Herter amendment but for a fixed price. I am much disquieted by that as should be every Member representing a city district, and for this reason. Here is what the figures show:

According to the Consumers' Price Index of the Department of Labor the consumers' prices for food between June, 1946, and June, 1947, have gone up from an index number of 145 to an index number of 190, about 30 percent, whereas the average prices for all essentials of family life have gone up only about 20 percent, from an index number of 133 to an index number of 157 (1935-39=100).

This Congress has shown a disposition to call to task any group in the country, no matter how large, when it felt that group to be getting out of balance with the rest. It did that very thing in connection with labor. I beg my friends and colleagues who represent the farm districts to go back this time and to see what you can do to help us city Members, and us city dwellers to bring down the cost of living, and to be sure that you in the agricultural districts do not get out of balance.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The gentleman fails to recognize that the high cost of food is largely due to the fact that we have shipped out eighteen and one-half million tons of food to other countries of the world at a cost of \$2,300,000,000 to the American people.

Mr. JAVITS. May I point out to the gentleman that the cost of what we ship out is determined by its price. If the gentleman will go into any cafeteria he will find that the American people are not short of food; we are sending our surplus.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section do now close.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this section do now close.

The motion was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 3. The Commodity Credit Corporation may, until December 31, 1948, dispose of wool owned by it without regard to any restriction imposed upon it by law.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

(Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I want to get our friends from the cities straightened out a little when they go home. They seem to be afraid to go home for some reason or other. When you go home at least tell your people the truth. You know, that is not a bad idea. As the old lady told the boy, "Always tell the truth and you will not have to remember what you said." That is all you have to do about this food situation. The price the farmer receives is not a high price. If some farm products in short supply are high, it is because of governmental action.

This is a rather peculiar thing, you know, if you come from a rural section. Today dairy products are selling at from one-fourth to one-third what they sold a year ago. I can take out of my pocket a letter I received today from a pea farmer who is getting less than 1 cent a pound for his peas. The parity price is 4½ cents. I can take another letter out of my pocket showing where they are putting the fur farmers out of business. Yet we have the Bureau of Labor Statistics every month telling us how much of an increase there is in the cost of living.

Let us get this straight. I do not know whether this has anything to do with the wool bill or not, but I want to say to every one who is here today, and I want it in the RECORD, the reason I am going to support this wool bill is because I have seen these farmers taken to the cleaners more than once before. Now they are going to have their pants taken off, and when they do at least I want them to have on a pair of good woolen pants to be taken off. This wool bill was around here last session. It is at least on the floor of the House for consideration. I realize we are over a legislative barrel. We are by necessity compelled to accept a legislative act repellent to many of us.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, it was stated here a while ago that the people who are interested in the defeat of this bill are of that opinion for selfish reasons. They say these people want to buy foreign wool. If that reference is made to me, may I say that I want to buy domestic wool. I want to develop the wool industry in this country, I want to see the American people prosper, and I want to keep the American standard of living high. There is no one who will work harder to do that than I. But unless we turn around here and do something different from what has been done by the New Deal in the last 10 or 15 years, we will find we are wrecking our whole economy. You will find that these reciprocal trade agreements are going to undermine the American manufacturer, they are going to undermine American labor, and they are going to undermine American industry. You put that down as coming from me, and I do not care whether they say I am going back 50 years. It seems to me they had lots of sense and were industrious. I am going back to the time when our forefathers made America one of the greatest countries on the face of the earth, and I am not interested in trying to ruin what we discovered.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield for a question.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Along the line the gentleman is talking, I want to read just a sentence from a letter from Boston. It says:

Right now thousands of woolen textile workers are out of work, and many eastern woolen mills are completely shut down.

Mr. RICH. After we get through following the New Deal you will find out that there will be a whole lot more things shut down. Whenever the time comes that you start in to establish prices and take the money out of the Treasury for subsidies, you are on the wrong foot. You have established a price of 28 cents on copper, you have established a price of 18 cents on lead, you have established an 18-cent price on zinc, you have established a high price on wool and on everything else, and then you go to the Treasury and take the money out. Where are you going to get that money? The first thing you know you are going to run out of money and you are going to wreck yourselves. Another thing you did. You came in here and said, "We want \$300,000,000 for Greece, we want \$100,000,000 for Turkey, we want \$3,750,000,000 for Great Britain, and three or four hundred million for all these other countries," but after a while you will find out that the bubble will burst and you will wish you would all have been sound Republicans like your grandfathers were instead of a lot of New Dealers. Wake up, think, and do it quick. If you do not, you will bust.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further amendments, under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. JENKINS of Ohio, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under considera-

tion the bill (S. 1498) to provide support for wool, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 315, he reported the bill back to the House.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, and was read the third time.

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. HERTER. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. HERTER moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Agriculture with instructions to report it back forthwith with the following amendment: Beginning in line 5, page 1, strike out the words "at the price it supported wool in 1946" and insert in lieu thereof the words, "at a price not less than 90 percent of parity."

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that it is not in order now to offer a motion to recommit with that provision, for the simple reason that the same provision has just been voted down by the House.

The SPEAKER. In a parliamentary way the House has no knowledge of what happened in the Committee.

The Chair overrules the point of order.

The question is on the motion to recommit offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HERTER].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HERTER) there were—ayes 64, noes 128.

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FIRST SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1948

Mr. TABER submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 4269) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4269) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 11, 14, 46, 68, and 69.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 12, 13, 15, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 26, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 39, 44, 45, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 59, 60, 61, 62, 66, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100, and 101, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 6: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert the following: "\$40,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 8: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert the following: "\$15,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 9: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert the following: "\$400,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 10: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert the following: "\$4,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 16: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "Provided further, That subject to the limitations and requirements of this paragraph this appropriation shall be available for the transportation of voluntary relief supplies shipped by relief agencies licensed for operation in Europe and in Asia including the occupied areas under such regulations as the Secretary of State may prescribe"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 24: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 24, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert the following: "\$4,250,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 25: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 25, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following:

"VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION"

"Automobiles and other conveyances for disabled veterans: For an additional amount for 'Automobiles and other conveyances for disabled veterans', \$5,000,000, to be available for the purposes specified under this head in the Act of August 8, 1946 (Public Law 663)."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 27: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 27, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert the following: "\$75,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 36: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 36, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert the following: "\$40,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 37: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 37, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert the following: "\$675,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 38: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 38, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert the following: "\$10,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 47: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 47, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert the following: "\$65,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 48: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 48, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert the following: "\$40,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 49: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 49, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed in line 2 of said amendment insert the following: "\$50,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 50: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 50, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert the following: "\$7,460,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 63: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 63, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert the following: "\$71,073,900"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 65: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 65, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert the following: "\$75,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 67: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 67, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert the following: "\$600,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 17, 40, 41, 42, 43, 58, and 64.

JOHN TABER,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
ALBERT J. ENGEL,
KARL STEFAN,
FRANCIS CASE,
FRANK B. KEEFE,
CLARENCE CANNON,
JOHN H. KERR,
GEORGE MAHON,

Managers on the Part of the House.

JOSEPH H. BALL,
C. WAYLAND BROOKS,
HOMER FERGUSON,
GUY CORDON,
CARL HAYDEN,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4269) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, submit the following report in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

TITLE I—DIRECT APPROPRIATIONS

Amendments Nos. 1, 2, 3, and 4 make appropriations for the Senate.

Amendment No. 5 appropriates \$100,000 for the Joint Committee on Labor-Management Relations as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 6 appropriates \$40,000 for the Aviation Policy Board instead of \$50,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 7 and 8 make appropriations for the Senate.

Amendment No. 9 appropriates \$400,000 for the Office of Defense Transportation instead of \$484,000 as proposed by the Senate and \$140,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 10 limits administrative expenses on the appropriation for assistance to Greece and Turkey to \$4,500,000 instead of \$5,177,900 as proposed by the Senate and \$3,800,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 11 limits District of Columbia allocation of administrative expenses to \$300,000 as proposed by the House instead of \$607,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 12 and 13 make formal changes in language.

Amendment No. 14 limits amount for administrative expenses to \$700,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$600,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 15 excepts from limitation allocations to the International Children's Emergency Fund.

Amendment No. 16 provides for payment by the Government of transportation charges on relief supplies from voluntary organizations.

Amendment No. 17 is reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 18 limits rates to be paid per diem experts at \$35 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$50 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 19 appropriates \$500,000 for the Public Health Service as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 20 appropriates \$8,026,000 for Social Security Administration as proposed by the Senate instead of \$12,026,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 21 and 22 provide for payment of damage claims.

Amendment No. 23 limits rates to be paid per diem experts at \$35 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$50 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 24 appropriates \$4,250,000 for Selective Service Records instead of \$4,000,000 as proposed by the House, and \$5,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 25 appropriates \$5,000,000 additional for automobiles for veteran amputees as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 26 appropriates \$17,500 for Animal Husbandry as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 27 appropriates \$75,000 for the Insecticide Act instead of \$100,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 28, 29, and 30 appropriate \$210,000 for Sugar Rationing Administration as proposed by the Senate instead of \$710,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 31 and 32 make formal changes in language.

Amendment No. 33 makes a time limitation 120 days as proposed by the Senate instead of 60 days as proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 34 and 35 appropriate \$39,520 as proposed by the Senate for Civil Aeronautics Administration.

Amendment No. 36 appropriates \$40,000 for air-navigation facilities instead of \$70,000 as proposed by the Senate. The amount should be sufficient if present equipment in towers to be equipped is fully utilized.

Amendment No. 37 appropriates \$675,000 for the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce instead of \$650,000 as proposed by the House and \$700,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 38 appropriates \$10,000 for field office service instead of \$15,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 39 requires certain items of terminal leave in the Coal Mines Administration to be paid by the Navy.

Amendments Nos. 40, 41, and 42, and 43 are reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 44 strikes out an appropriation of \$375,000 proposed by the House for Alaska Native Service.

Amendment No. 45 strikes out an appropriation of \$250,000 proposed by the House for purchase and transportation of Indian supplies.

Amendment No. 46 appropriates \$302,300 as proposed by the House for the Indian Service.

Amendment No. 47 appropriates \$65,000 for national parks instead of \$50,000 as proposed by the House and \$89,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 48 appropriates \$40,000 for Fish and Wildlife Service instead of \$30,000 as proposed by the House and \$50,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 49 allocates \$50,000 for departmental services instead of \$28,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 50 appropriates \$7,460,000 for public employment offices instead of \$9,460,000 as proposed by the House and \$1,460,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 51, 52, 53, and 54 provide for payment of damage claims as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 55, 56, and 57 make appropriations for Department of State as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 59, 60, 61, and 62 make adjustments in limitations in the Department of State as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 63 appropriates \$1,073,900 for International Relief Organization instead of \$71,024,900 as proposed by the House and \$73,361,400 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 64 reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 65 provides a contract authorization of \$15,000,000 instead of \$100,000,000 as proposed by the Senate and \$50,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 66 limits rates to be paid per diem experts at \$35 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$50 as proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 67 and 68 appropriate \$600,000,000 for government and relief in occupied areas instead of \$550,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$625,000,000 plus a contract authorization of \$100,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 69 restores language proposed by the House to require payment of travel allowances of military personnel from the "Government and relief" appropriation.

Amendment No. 70 strikes from the bill language authorizing payment of transportation charges on voluntary relief shipments.

Amendment No. 71 to 99, inclusive, provide for payment of damage claims and judgments as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 100 explains the opinion of Congress that expenditures for food stuffs should be for those items which can be purchased with benefit to the national economy.

Amendment No. 101 changes a section number.

AMENDMENTS IN DISAGREEMENT

The managers on the part of the House have authorized the following motions with respect to the amendments reported in disagreement:

Amendment No. 17: That the House recede and concur with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter inserted by the said amendment insert: "and in addition military appropriations may be expended for such purposes, not exceeding \$15,000,000, in contemplation of reimbursement if justified."

Amendments Nos. 40, 41, 42, and 43: That the House insist on disagreement.

Amendment No. 58: That the House recede and concur with an amendment limiting the amount of the proposed transfer to \$500,000 instead of \$600,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 64: That the House recede and concur in the said amendment with an

amendment limiting the amount available to \$15,000 per annum.

JOHN TABER,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
ALBERT J. ENGEL,
KARL STEFAN,
FRANCIS CASE,
FRANK B. KEEFE,
CLARENCE CANNON,
JOHN H. KERR,
GEORGE MAHON,

Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill H. R. 4269 and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. CANNON. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, and I shall not object, may I ask the gentleman if we will be permitted to have some of the time on this side?

Mr. TABER. I have told the gentleman that I would yield him 30 minutes. That will be all that I will be able to yield. If I do that, I will be unable to yield any time to anyone else.

Mr. CANNON. That will be satisfactory, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this bill represents as the conference report is presented to you \$1,657,000,000. That is \$54,000,000 above what it was as it passed the House and \$23,000,000 less than it was as it passed the Senate. There are two or three amendments in disagreement which run to perhaps \$1,000,000. There are several items of contract authorizations involved, and they have been reduced more than the appropriations. In one particular item there was a reduction of \$100,000,000 and in another \$25,000,000.

I wish to say with reference to one of these items that the item for relief in occupied territory has been reported back with \$600,000,000 in cash available and no contract authorization.

At the present time the pipe lines are loaded so that they will carry through according to the estimates of the War Department in Germany until the 1st of November, and in Japan and Korea until the 1st of December.

It seem absolutely ridiculous that we supply funds to carry as long a term into the fiscal year 1949 as that and the Senate yielded upon the contract authorizations and on \$25,000,000 of the appropriation in connection with that.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time and yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, on this concluding day of the session, at the close of the fiscal program for the year, may I take advantage of the opportunity to express my appreciation of the privilege of having served under the speakership of the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts, Speaker MARTIN. When the

[PUBLIC LAW 360—80TH CONGRESS]

[CHAPTER 488—1ST SESSION]

[S. 1498]

AN ACT

To provide support for wool, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) The Commodity Credit Corporation shall continue, until December 31, 1948, to support a price to producers of wool in the continental United States and Territories at the price it supported wool in 1946.

(b) Notwithstanding any other provisions hereof, the Commodity Credit Corporation may adjust support prices for individual grades and qualities of wool for the purpose of bringing about a fair and equitable relationship in the support prices for the various grades and qualities of wool; and may make discounts from support prices for off-quality, inferior-grade, or poorly prepared wool.

SEC. 2. The provisions of sections 385, 386, and 388 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, shall be applicable to the support operations carried out pursuant to the first section of this Act.

SEC. 3. The Commodity Credit Corporation may, until December 31, 1948, dispose of wool owned by it without regard to any restriction imposed upon it by law.

Approved August 5, 1947.

